MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. 55, NO. 1 MARCH, 1960

CONTENTS

Annual Subscription to the Magazine, $4.00. Each issue $1.00. The Magazine assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions expressed in its pages.

Richard Walsh, *Editor*

C. A. Porter Hopkins, *Asst. Editor*

The Magazine is entered as second class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under Act of August 24, 1912.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY

Add 25 cents for mailing and

Maryland sales tax where applicable.

His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland, by Donnell M. Owings. 1953. (Studies in Maryland History No. 1) .. $6.00

Baltimore as Seen by Visitors, 1783-1860. Raphael Semmes. 1953. (Studies in Maryland History, No. 2) $4.00

The Dulanys of Maryland, Biographical Study Daniel Dulany, the Elder, and the Younger. By Aubrey C. Land. 1955. (Studies in Maryland History, No. 3) $6.00

William Buckland, 1734-1774. Architect of Virginia and Maryland. By Rosamond Randall Beirne and John Henry Scarff, F. A. I. A. 1958. (Studies in Maryland History, No. 4) $7.50

The Star-Spangled Banner Manuscript in Facsimile. Encased in handsome folder.. $1.00

The Star-Spangled Banner. Illustrated booklet. Description of the writing of our National Anthem. By Harold R. and Beta K. Manakee, 1954 $ .50

Indians of Early Maryland. By Harold R. Manakee, 1959. 48 pp....... Cloth bound $1.80

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

A Quarterly

Volume 55 MARCH, 1960 Number 1

PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE, 1790–1840:

A STUDY OF INTRA-REGIONAL UNITY

By Jane N. Garrett †

HISTORIANS have generally taken for granted the existence of an underlying unity between Maryland and the South. It has been assumed that what was true of early, tobacco producing, tidewater Maryland also applied to the post-1760 period and included the Piedmont regions. Since the early planters gravitated toward Virginia, it has been assumed that the later merchants followed their example. But the conventional theory of Maryland's inseparable tie with the South is only tenable for the seventeenth

† This article represents with revision a portion of the author's Honors thesis, "The Philadelphia and Baltimore Spheres of Influence, 1790-1840," University of Delaware, 1957.

and early eighteenth centuries; and its attribution to the post-Revolutionary period is a projection of ideas forward where they have no place.

Looking at the "Chesapeake Society" in retrospect, one can regard it with respect and nostalgia.[1] It accorded well with early tidewater Maryland before a grain economy supplanted tobacco, when slavery formed the basis of the colony's labor supply, when its iron ore and water power were only beginning to be important, when Baltimore was still a village, and when its unique tobacco land alone was its great resource. It was during the last half of the eighteenth century that grain and milling suddenly leaped forward into a place of commanding influence. The effect upon the economy was spectacular, and Baltimore gradually supplanted Annapolis as the economic and cultural center of the state. This article attempts to demonstrate through a study of Maryland's relationship with Pennsylvania between 1790 and 1840 that from the middle of the eighteenth century, Maryland, and particularly Baltimore, faced northward and was more fully within Philadelphia's sphere of influence than that of the South.

The story of Philadelphia and Baltimore from 1790 to 1840 is the study of maturity on the one hand and infancy and growth on the other. Philadelphia was founded in the later part of the seventeenth century and rapidly developed into a city of considerable size; Baltimore was not founded until 1729, nor chartered until 1797. The latter town, furthermore, did not enjoy such rapid growth as did Philadelphia. In 1752, over twenty years after its founding, Baltimore was still living in the shadow of Annapolis and consisted of only 200 inhabitants. Philadelphia at this time had a population of over 13,000.[2] In 1764 Governor Sharpe, writing to Lord Baltimore, remarked that although Baltimore transacted more business than any city in Maryland, she was yet to Philadelphia as Dover was to London.[3] But Baltimore was not long destined to remain a provincial town.

During the Revolutionary period Baltimore received, from being

[1] Carl Bridenbaugh, *Myths and Realities, Societies of the Old South* (Baton Rouge, 1952). In Chapter I Bridenbaugh includes Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina in a "Chesapeake Society."

[2] Horace M. Lippincott, *Early Philadelphia, Its People, Life and Progress* (Philadelphia, 1917), Chapter II; S. N. D. North, *A Century of Population Growth, 1790-1909* (Washington, 1909), p. 11.

[3] *Arch. Md.*, XIV, 173.

a blockade-free port, the necessary impetus to make valid her claim to urbanization. The rise of Baltimore was further aided by a basic change in the Maryland economy—the shift in staple from tobacco to grain. In the decade from 1790 to 1800, the population of the city rose from 13,503 to 31,518, and Baltimore was indeed "a group of cabins to a city chang'd." [4] Philadelphia, meanwhile, lost its leadership in export trade to New York early in the nineteenth century but remained commercially strong and was not surpassed as the cultural center of the country. Baltimore's link with the Middle Atlantic region also manifested itself in an intimate connection with Philadelphia's hinterland, especially with the prosperous agricultural country between the Susquehanna River and the Allegheny Mountains. In this area, whose population more than tripled between 1790 and 1840, lived approximately one quarter of the inhabitants of Pennsylvania. The location of the greatest portion of these central Pennsylvanians between the Maryland line and Pennsylvania's geographical center made them very susceptible to Baltimore's influence which extended across the border and up the Susquehanna River.[5]

Contact between Maryland and Pennsylvania was stimulated by natural similarities and by the developing communications that both followed the coast and crisscrossed the back-country. The most popular stage route ran from Philadelphia to Elkton, across the Susquehanna to Havre de Grace and on to Baltimore. But it was equally possible to travel via the Philadelphia, Brandywine and New London Turnpike chartered in 1809, by way of Lancaster and York or Lancaster and Harrisburg.[6] In addition to the overland stages there was a packet-stage combination which conveyed passengers down the Delaware by sloop to New Castle, by stage to Frenchtown on the Elk River, and by sloop again down the Chesapeake to Baltimore.

The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, opened in 1829, facil-

[4] Jared Sparks, "Baltimore," *North American Review,* XX (January, 1825), 109; *Newport* [Rhode Island] *Mercury,* June 28, 1790.

[5] North, *A Century of Population Growth,* Tables 104, 196-198; *Compendium of the Sixth Census* (Washington, 1841), p. 26.

[6] For descriptions of these various routes see: Duc de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, *Travels Through the United States . . . 1795, 1796, and 1797,* 4 vol. (London, 1800), III, 262; John T. Faris, *Olds Roads Out of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1917), pp. 78-79; Philadelphia, *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser,* March 1-2, 1830; *Baltimore American,* March 2, 1830; Thomas Hamilton, *Men and Manners in America,* 2 vol. (Edinburgh, 1833), II, 1-6.

itated communications between the two bays although the project was largely conceived and sponsored by Philadelphians whose purpose it was to divert some of the trade flowing down the Susquehanna River.[7] The canal itself was intended for freight traffic while the New Castle and Frenchtown Railroad provided passenger service. But even the building of a railroad to improve the efficiency of the New Castle-Frenchtown route could not forestall the demise of that line once direct rail communications were established between Baltimore and Philadelphia in 1838.[8]

In Pennsylvania's interior the Susquehanna, which led directly to the Chesapeake Bay and Baltimore, was the dominant feature of that region's communication system. The West Branch provided an outlet for the northern counties and the Juniata connected the central counties with the main river traffic. Since the lower Susquehanna was virtually unnavigable, Philadelphia merchants were able to direct some produce into their city by providing a good overland route via the Lancaster Turnpike. But Baltimore capitalists, not to be outdone, financed mills at York Haven to mill the wheat from up-river and sent the flour by wagons to Baltimore.[9] The development of arks and rafts in the 1790's enabled boatmen to run the rapids and falls safely, but these could be used only for descending navigation. Once the arks reached Havre de Grace at the mouth of the Susquehanna the produce was transferred to bay shallops and carried to Baltimore.[10]

The years between 1790 and 1840 were marked by a continuous effort on the part of both Philadelphia and Baltimore to tap the trade of central Pennsylvania by means of canals. Baltimoreans put their efforts into a canal around the obstructions in the lower Susquehanna, and by 1803 such a canal had been completed from tidewater to the Pennsylvania line. But since Pennsylvania failed to improve the navigation beyond her boundary the venture proved unsuccessful. Not until 1840 was the Susquehanna or Tidewater Canal, beginning at Wrightsville and continuing down the west

[7] James W. Livingood, *The Philadelphia-Baltimore Trade Rivalry, 1780-1860* (Harrisburg, 1947); Ralph D. Gray, "Early History of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal," *Delaware History*, VIII (March, 1959), 207-264.

[8] Edward Hungerford, *The Story of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, 1827-1927*, 2 vol. (New York, 1928), I, 195.

[9] Livingood, *Philadelphia-Baltimore Trade Rivalry*, pp. 29-30.

[10] Seymour Dunbar, *A History of Travel in America*, 4 vol. (Indianapolis, 1915), I, 284.

bank to Havre de Grace, completed.[11] Philadelphia countered with a plan for a canal between the Susquehanna and the Schuylkill which was finally realized in the Union Canal, opened in 1828, and followed a year later by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. By 1834 the main line of the Pennsylvania State System had been completed, and Pittsburgh and intermediate points were thereby connected to the Susquehanna by water, except for a short portage railway between Holidaysburg and Johnstown. Further north the West Branch Canal connected Bellefonte and Lock Haven with Sunbury.[12]

While Baltimore's Susquehanna canal project progressed slowly, turnpikes and finally the railroad kept the Chesapeake port in contact with the Pennsylvania hinterland to the north. Many of the principal roads and turnpikes of central Pennsylvania made connections at the Pennsylvania-Maryland line with turnpikes such as the York, Reisterstown, and Frederick, which ran northwestward from Baltimore. Stages advertised for Gettysburg and Chambersburg with the added inducement that their travelling time was approximately one-half the time it took the stages to come from Philadelphia.[13] Railroads from both Philadelphia and Baltimore also penetrated central Pennsylvania. The Cumberland Valley Railroad completed between Carlisle and Harrisburg in 1837 joined with the Harrisburg and Lancaster and the Philadelphia and Columbia to link the central counties with Philadelphia. But by 1840 Baltimore also had rail communications with this area via the Baltimore and Susquehanna to York and an extension to Wrightsville on the river.[14]

Related to the excellent communications between Pennsylvania and Maryland was a close economic connection. Early in the eighteenth century, long before Baltimore became northern Mary-

[11] Livingood, *Philadelphia-Baltimore Trade Rivalry*, 33-36; Charles B. Trego, *A Geography of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1843), 157.

[12] Hubertis Cummings, "The Pennsylvania Canals," *Historic Pennsylvania Leaflet No. 1*, Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission (Harrisburg, 1949), p. 2; Richard I. Shelling, "Philadelphia and the Agitation in 1825 for the Pennsylvania Canal," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (*PMHB*), LXII (1938), pp. 175-204.

[13] Joseph A. Durrenberger, *Turnpikes, A Study of the Toll Road Movement in the Middle Atlantic States and Maryland* (Valdosta, 1931), p. 38; Chambersburg, *Franklin Repository*, March 20, 1810; Baltimore, *Morning Chronicle*, March 1, 1820; *Baltimore Sun*, March 3, 1840.

[14] Livingood, *Philadelphia-Baltimore Trade Rivalry*, 145-147; *Baltimore American*, March 2, 1840; York, *Pennsylvania Republican*, March 4, 1840.

land's commercial outlet, Philadelphia was of immense economic importance to that area. With the rise of Baltimore a gradual shift took place in which the importance of Philadelphia as a market for northern Maryland products decreased, since obviously these communities would gravitate toward the new urban center close at hand. Besides this urban-rural relationship there is still another force that must be accounted for in any regional study, an inter-urban relationship, in this case between Baltimore and Philadelphia. In short, while Philadelphia may have lost a portion of her hinterland to the younger city, Baltimore itself faced northward and engaged in an inter-urban relationship with Philadelphia.

Newspapers published in Pennsylvania and Maryland between 1790 and 1840 provide an excellent indication of the closeness of the two areas. Philadelphia items appeared frequently in Baltimore newspapers and vice versa. In 1790 and 1791 Maryland glass of " excellent quality and much cheaper than imported " was advertised in Philadelphia. The *Baltimore American* in 1810 advertised " Freight wanted for Philadelphia " and a " Sale of books, etc., of James Humphreys, deceased Philadelphia printer and bookseller." Philadelphia newspapers at the same time were advertising, among other things, an auction in Baltimore, a Baltimore proposal for printing a *Journal of Music*, the *Baltimore Directory*, and a Baltimore " want-ad " for brush-makers.[15] Likewise it was common for Philadelphia manufacturers and business establishments to advertise in Baltimore newspapers: R. F. Allen and Company advertised a silk sale, Charles Johnson and Son their printing ink manufactory, and Mortimer and Samuel N. Lewis their commission business.[16] Baltimore milliners went to Philadelphia to procure the newest fashions, and items such as doors, paperhangings, hair powder, clocks, jewelry, fabrics, ladies' shoes, wine and beer were all procured from Philadelphia by Baltimore shopkeepers.[17]

It was also common to find central Pennsylvanians advertising in Baltimore newspapers. John Fisher, a York clockmaker, did so

[15] *Baltimore American*, March 6, 1810; March 24, 1810; Philadelphia: *Pennsylvania Packet*, September 24, 1790; July 6, 1791; *True American*, March 1, 1810; *Aurora*, March 23, 1810; March 16, 1810; March 2, 1810.

[16] *Baltimore American*, March 1, 1830; March 17, 1830; March 19, 1830.

[17] Baltimore, *Maryland Journal*, February 7, 1786; April 26, 1791; October 18, 1785; August 26, 1788; January 3, 1794; May 7, 1793; January 4, 1791; March 30, 1795; December 28, 1792; May 8, 1795; *Baltimore Daily Repository*, June 7, 1793; July 31, 1792; *Baltimore American*, March 3, 1810; Baltimore, *Maryland Gazette*, August 24, 1790.

as did Charles Smith of Lancaster who offered to rent a " merchant and saw mill " in Huntingdon.[18] Baltimore merchants likewise utilized local Pennsylvania newspapers for their advertisements. Samuel Frey in 1800 informed his customers in the York area that he was moving his warehouse in Baltimore. In 1810 Magill and Clime recommended their new book and stationery store to the readers of the Chambersburg and York newspapers, George Kaper advertised Russian bristles, and Dorsey's Forge advertised for a laborer.[19] E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company instructed Bradford and Cooch in 1827 to insert advertisements in the newspapers of York, Chambersburg, and other Pennsylvania interior towns " which naturally trade with Baltimore." [20] A systematic analysis of such advertisements shows rather conclusively Baltimore's interest in central Pennsylvania and vice versa.

Philadelphia businessmen and artisans often found it advantageous to move to the rising young city to the South, and Philadelphia and Baltimore businessmen were similarly inclined to form partnerships or intimate connections. Robert Oliver of Baltimore depended upon his brother-in-law, John Craig, of Philadelphia to supply him with bank notes, commercial information, and investment suggestions.[21] William Hammond of Baltimore and Levi Hollingsworth of Philadelphia jointly owned a copper works in Frederick County, Maryland, and Baltimore's James Matthews and Philadelphia's John McAllister entered into a partnership in a whip and cane business in Baltimore.[22]

The connections between the inland counties of Pennsylvania and Maryland were further facilitated by the homogeneous character of the settlers of the two areas who were, for the most part, of the same background and lived under similar conditions. Whereas the Germans and English dominated eastern Pennsylvania, the Scotch-Irish were the dominant element in the central and

[18] Baltimore, *Maryland Gazette*, September 10, 1790; *Maryland Journal*, June 14, 1793.

[19] *York Recorder*, April 2, 1800; April 14, 1810; Chambersburg, *Franklin Repository*, March 27, 1810.

[20] E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. to Bradford and Cooch, Baltimore, August 17, 1827; E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. Letterbook, May 30, 1827-April 21, 1829, MSS, Hagley Museum.

[21] Stuart Bruchey, *Robert Oliver, Merchant of Baltimore, 1783-1819*, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Poltical Science, LXXIV (Baltimore, 1956), *passim*.

[22] Philadelphia, *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1781; *Federal Gazette*, March 26, 1800.

western parts of the state as they were in Maryland's back-country. The divergent interests of rural and urban Pennsylvania affected both the politics and economics of the state and helped to pull central Pennsylvania into a Baltimore sphere of influence. Thomas Paine, in a letter to Daniel Clymer dated September 1786, complained that the back-country members of Pennsylvania's Assembly were uninterested in the activity of the eastern section because they engaged in no commercial intercourse east of the Susquehanna and were entirely within the commercial sphere of Baltimore. Paine later quipped, "they come here to legislate and go there to trade." [23]

The problem of central Pennsylvania's failure to trade with Philadelphia was an old one. When the settlers moved beyond the Susquehanna, Philadelphia merchants assumed that intra-state trade would continue. Furthermore, after the violent border dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland, they did not expect any Pennsylvanians to deal with Baltimore merchants. The central Pennsylvanians were, however, more disposed to trade with Baltimore since the distance was reduced by half and they could eliminate the costs of ferriage over the Susquehanna.[24] In 1771 a Philadelphia "Friend to Trade" warned that:

> Baltimore town in Maryland has within a few years past carried off from this city [Philadelphia] almost the whole trade of Frederick, York, Bedford, and Cumberland Counties.[25]

By 1800 the *United States Gazette* reported:

> Philadelphia is known to carry on little of the export trade for the counties of Pennsylvania, which lie to the westward of the Susquehanna. Baltimore does much of the business of the South westerly parts of Chester and Lancaster, and nearly all the business of Cumberland, York, and Franklin. The other counties on the Susquehanna, on the east and west branches, Juniata, and Pennscreek, also carry on trade through Baltimore.[26]

The preoccupation of Baltimore with the Susquehanna Valley was so great that even Philadelphians sometimes questioned the

[23] Philip S. Foner, *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine* (New York, 1945), pp. 434, 1256.

[24] St. George L. Sioussat, "Highway Legislation in Maryland and Its Influence on the Economic Development of the State," *Maryland Geological Survey* (Baltimore, 1899), III, 131-132.

[25] Charles H. Lincoln, *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1901), 65.

[26] Philadelphia, *Gazette of the United States*, May 1, 1800.

inclusion of the central counties within Pennsylvania. In 1830 a correspondent of the *U. S. Gazette* asked the question, "whether Baltimore be in Pennsylvania or not?" The editor of the *York Republican* answered:

> We cannot say that Baltimore is in Pennsylvania, but we can say, that York ought to be in Maryland, judging from the language of Philadelphians to her. The people of York cannot trade with Philadelphia more than they do: They sell their produce in Baltimore, and buy their goods in Philadelphia; yet, forsooth, those who claim to be our masters, are not satisfied, because we will not haul our marketing double the distance, pay double the tolls and then give them away. Ask your correspondent, Gentlemen, if he ever read the fable of the boy and the filberts.[27]

Baltimore interest did not stop at the Juniata but extended into the more northern reaches of central Pennsylvania. Iron, furs, and skins were shipped down the river to Middletown where many were sent via the Susquehanna to Baltimore. Large amounts of timber were also sent down the river from northern Pennsylvania to Baltimore.[28] General John Burrows of Lycoming County in northern Pennsylvania wrote in 1837 that he had sold in Baltimore the surplus produce from his farm for almost four thousand dollars "and besides feed, grain, meat, and bread." [29]

There were also strong cultural ties which bound Maryland to Pennsylvania and gave them a common personality. The excellence of its eighteenth century schools, for example, made Philadelphia a Mecca for students from New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. In 1754 "Philo Marylandus" complained in the *Maryland Gazette* that at least 100 Marylanders were enrolled in the Academy at Philadelphia.[30] Between 1757 and the Revolution about 210 young men matriculated at the College of Philadelphia and of these thirty-six were from Maryland.[31] Between 1790 and 1840 Baltimore and Maryland in general, continued to send a considerable number of students to college in Philadelphia. Maryland's Western

[27] *York Republican*, March 16, 1830.

[28] Arthur C. Bining, "Iron Plantations of Early Pennsylvania," *PMHB*, LVII (1933), 131-132.

[29] "Autobiographical Sketch of the Life of General John Burrows of Lycoming County," *PMHB*, XXXIV (1910), 434-435.

[30] Annapolis, *Maryland Gazette*, March 21, 1754.

[31] Carl and Jessica Bridenbaugh, *Rebels and Gentlemen, Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin* (New York, 1942), p. 63. Eighty-six students came from Philadelphia, 37 from other parts of Pennsylvania, 36 from Maryland, and the remainder from Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina.

Shore, in fact, provided more students than did the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Delaware, or the remainder of Pennsylvania beyond Philadelphia's neighboring counties.[32] Philadelphians also went to Baltimore for training. During the school year 1835-36 and again during 1840-41, there were more students from Philadelphia enrolled at Baltimore's St. Mary's College than from Maryland's Eastern Shore, Delaware, or from the remainder of Pennsylvania.[33] Close educational ties were thus maintained between the Chesapeake and the Delaware.

In the realm of the decorative arts, too, there was a substantial crisscrossing of Philadelphia and Baltimore influences. During the Queen Anne and Chippendale periods, when Philadelphia cabinetmaking was at its height, both Maryland and New Jersey furniture shared the character of the Philadelphia school. Baltimore cabinetmakers reached their excellence late in the eighteenth century. Following Hepplewhite's *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholster's Guide* (London, 1788) and Sheraton's *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing-Book* (London, 1791-94), Baltimore entered its noonday of furniture production by executing pieces that influenced cabinetmakers of Pennsylvania and are still treasured for their lightness, delicacy, and chaste ornament. This artistic achievement coincided with Baltimore's burst of economic prosperity at the turn of the century.[34] Although many Baltimore cabinetmakers came directly from England, occasionally they moved there from Philadelphia. Gerrand Hopkins of Philadelphia, for example, opened a shop on Gay Street in Baltimore and advertised in the *Maryland Journal* until 1793 when he formed the partnership of Hopkins and Harris.[35]

Further elegance was added to life on the Chesapeake by Baltimore patrons looking directly to the Philadelphia craftsmen. Before Baltimore became a cultural center in her own right, Philadelphia was the logical place to secure the services of a silversmith, clockmaker, or portrait painter. By 1790 the market looked so good in Baltimore that some enterprising Philadelphia

[32] Society of the Alumni, University of Pennsylvania, *Matriculates of the College, 1749-1893* (Philadelphia, 1894).

[33] St. Mary's College, Baltimore, *1835-36 Catalogue, 1840-41 Catalogue*, Md. Hist. Soc.

[34] Joseph Downs, *American Furniture, Queen Anne and Chippendale Periods in the Henry Francis DuPont Winterthur Museum* (New York, 1952), xxvi; Baltimore Museum of Art, *Baltimore Furniture, 1760-1810* (Baltimore, 1947), *passim*.

[35] Baltimore, *Maryland Journal*, April 30, 1793.

craftsmen left the older city for the younger. Silversmiths and jewelers like Nicholas Brooks and Jeremiah Andrews came.[36] Others moved like William Ball, the son of a Philadelphia goldsmith of the same name; the clock and watchmakers, Emmor Bailey, John Jackson, and David Evans came to Baltimore from Philadelphia shortly after 1800. In 1795 Leslie and Price, Philadelphia watch and clockmakers, announced a partnership with Abraham Patton who was opening a business in Baltimore. Baltimoreans also patronized such men as Henry Elonis, a limner who travelled between the two cities, and John Mason, an upholsterer from Philadelphia.[37] It was natural too for young Marylanders of ambition and talent, such as Charles Willson Peale, to seek their fortunes in Philadelphia. Between 1769 and 1773 Peale made at least one visit to Philadelphia each year and moved there in 1776. Baltimoreans expressed interest in his museum in Philadelphia, and, although the first attempt was short lived, Peale's sons, Raphaelle and Rembrandt were sent to Baltimore to set up a similar establishment. While in Baltimore, Raphaelle frequently advertised in Philadelphia newspapers his talent as a protrait painter.[38]

In the printing and publishing trades, Baltimore likewise looked to Philadelphia for a supply of young craftsmen. Early Baltimore saw Nicholas Hasselbach and William Goddard of Philadelphia establish a printing business and Baltimore's first newspaper, respectively.[39] Until the latter development in 1773, Baltimoreans were entirely dependent upon Annapolis and Philadelphia newspapers. Other Philadelphia printers later established themselves in Baltimore—David Graham in 1791, Samuel Sauer in 1792, Hezekiah Niles in 1805, and Arunah S. Abell in 1837. Similarly,

[36] *Ibid.*, August 28-September 4, 1773; December 17, 1784; Philadelphia, *Pennsylvania Packet*, July 31, 1775; May 23, 1780.

[37] Balitmore, *Maryland Journal*, October 8, 1790; August 20, 1773; August 16, 1791; June 14, 1791; *Baltimore Daily Repository*, May 13, 1793; *Federal Intelligencer*, November 13, 1795; Philadelphia, *General Advertiser*, February 21, 1792; *Pennsylvania Packet*, July 21, 1792; August 16, 1792; *Federal Gazette*, April 19, 1794; George H. Eckhardt, *Pennsylvania Clocks and Clockmakers* (New York, 1955), 38, 216.

[38] Charles Coleman Sellers, *Charles Willson Peale* (Philadelphia, 1947), I, 95-96; Baltimore, *Maryland Gazette*, February 15, 1791; *Maryland Journal*, January 31, 1792; Philadelphia, *Pennsylvania Packet*, January 30, 1797; May 15, 1797; February 12, 1799; December 3, 1800; *Federal Gazette*, June 16, 1800; September 11, 1800.

[39] J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Baltimore City and County* (Philadelphia, 1881), p. 605; Dieter Cunz, *The Maryland Germans* (Princeton, 1948), p. 111.

Fielding Lucas Jr. departed Philadelphia for Baltimore in 1803 and within seven years had risen to become one of the nation's excellent book and map sellers and publishers.[40] It is interesting to note, moreover, that Robert Walsh, a young Baltimore writer, looked to Philadelphia in 1809 to find a publisher for his anti-Gallician pamphlet, *A Letter on the Genius and Dispositions of the French Government.*[41]

Churches forged still another link in the chain binding Baltimore to Philadelphia. The Philadelphia-Baltimore area was the center of Methodism in the colonies and although the first American Methodist conferences were held in Philadelphia, Baltimore became the meeting place in 1776. Here the very important formative Christmas Conference was held in 1784-1785. Philadelphia, Trenton, and New York did not have conferences of their own until 1789.[42] The Baltimore Quakers, on the other hand, received support from their brethren in Philadelphia, and the Maryland Friends were actually a part of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting until 1788 even though a yearly meeting met in Baltimore in 1785. When the split occurred in 1827 between the Hicksite and Orthodox Quakers, the Baltimoreans followed the Middle Atlantic trend of Hicksite teaching, while no split occurred in either the South or in New England.[43] Baltimore Baptists, Lutherans, and Presbyterians were also closely allied to their respective churches in Philadelphia. Indeed the Maryland Presbyterians were, until 1854, under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Philadelphia.[44]

[40] Baltimore, *Maryland Journal*, June 24, 1791; Louis P. Henninghausen, *History of the German Society of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1909), p. 47; Scharf, *History of Baltimore*, p. 617; for Lucas, see James W. Foster, *Fielding Lucas, Jr. . . .* (Worcester, 1956).

[41] Sister M. Frederick Lochemes, *Robert Walsh* (Washington, 1941), pp. 56-58.

[42] See: James M. Buckley, *A History of Methodism in the United States* (New York, 1897); James E. Armstrong, *History of the Old Baltimore Conference* (Baltimore, 1907); also N. C. Hughes, Jr., "The Methodist Christmas Conference: Baltimore . . .," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XLIV (Sept., 1959), 272-292.

[43] See: James Bowden, *The History of the Society of Friends in America* (London, 1850); Anne B. Thomas, *The Story of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 1672-1938* (Baltimore, n. d.).

[44] Robert C. Torbert, *A Social History of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1707-1940* (Philadelphia, 1944); Ernest L. Hazelius, *History of the American Lutheran Church, 1685-1842* (Zanesville, 1846); Cunz, *The Maryland Germans*; J. L. Vallandingham and Samuel A. Gayley, *History of the Presbytery of New Castle* (Philadelphia, n. d.); John P. Carter, *Historical Sketch of the Synod of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1889); Joseph M. Wilson, *The Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrance of the Church for 1858-59* (Philadelphia, 1859), p. 74.

Further evidence of Baltimore looking northward can be found in the church organization of rural Pennsylvania. Within the Baltimore conference of the Methodist Church there were in 1789 several central and western Pennsylvania circuits. While some of these were transferred to Philadelphia early in the nineteenth century, the Susquehanna District was created as part of the Baltimore Conference, and by 1820 the Baltimore Conference added the Mishannon, Chambersburg, Somerset, and York circuits. The Society of Friends were also responsible for the spread of Baltimore influence in central Pennsylvania. In 1790 the newly established meetings there were transferred to the Baltimore Yearly Meeting. Baltimore Presbyterians also looked northward to include York within their Presbytery.[45]

Philadelphia and Baltimore were, then, bound together by direct contacts, cultural interchange and their urban-rural relationships with an overlapping hinterland. Natural features in common, such as location on the fall line, and a mutual reliance on grain as a staple aided the kinship as did the constant movement of businessmen, politicians, lawyers, students, artists and craftsmen between the two cities. It was an essential characteristic of the metamorphosis from an agrarian to a business economy that Baltimore's business should expand and compete with that of Philadelphia. Although this rivalry may have provided a source of contention between the merchants of Philadelphia and Baltimore, its very existence reveals the regional interdependence of the two cities. It was indeed significant that it was to the backcountry of Pennsylvania that expanding Baltimore looked for a hinterland rather than to Virginia. Although it cannot be said that Philadelphia played a negligible role west of the Susquehanna or that the South played a negligible role in Maryland, Baltimore influence was stronger in central Pennsylvania than it was in any other area outside the boundaries of Maryland, and Philadelphia influence was stronger in Baltimore than any other outside force. Indeed, Philadelphia influenced Baltimore more than it did any other area, with the obvious exception of the adjacent counties of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and northern Delaware. Even when allowances are made for occasional contradictions and historical hindsight, a Middle Atlantic orientation must be acknowledged for Baltimore and for a large portion of Maryland.

[45] Armstrong, *Old Baltimore Conference*; Thomas, *Baltimore Yearly Meeting*, pp. 47-48; Vallandingham and Gayley, *Presbytery of New Castle*, p. 9.

THE WORK OF CHARLES-HONORÉ LANNUIER, FRENCH CABINET-MAKER IN NEW YORK

By LORRAINE W. PEARCE

IN 1804, *Longworth's New York City Directory* carried for the first time the notice: "Lannuier, Henry, cabinetmaker, 60 Broad"; a notice to be repeated every year until 1819. This is the first recorded presence in the city of a twenty-six year old craftsman from Paris, trained in the distinguished tradition of French *ébénisterie*: Charles-Honoré Lannuier, or Henry Lannuier, as he was more briefly known in New York.[1] This young cabinetmaker became a leader in the production of fashionable furniture for New Yorkers and through his knowledge of French skills and styles helped to create the Empire style in New York city. The body of furniture now known to have been made by Lannuier is interesting and important, in itself, as it clarifies the development of both the style and technique of a talented craftsman, and for its relationship to existing tradition in France and changing styles in America.

Of the personal life of Charles-Honoré Lannuier, very little is known. He was one of nine children, the youngest son born to Michel Cyrille Lannuier and his wife Marie-Genéviève, in the town of Chantilly, forty miles north of Paris, on June 27, 1779.[2]

[1] Cabinetmaking in the French sense refers specifically to the veneering of furniture. The fashion for veneered furniture apparently began with the use of *ébène* or ebony, hence the origin of the word. A furniture maker who does not veneer is known in France as a *menuisier* (joiner), and there are specific titles also for men who did nothing else but turn, carve, gild, or paint furniture.

[2] Five baptismal certificates for Lannuier children are still preserved in the parish registers of the Chantilly city-hall. They are for Thérèse Julie (1771), Angélique Justine (1772), François Casimir (1775), Jean Stanislas (1776), and Charles-Honoré Lannuier (1779). Copies of these certificates were sent to me on May 20, 1957 and are in my possession. The names of the remaining children, Victor Stanislas, Maximilien Auguste, Nicolas-Louis Cyrille, and Etienne Magloire, appear in other legal documents that concern the Lannuiers. A tenth child of Michel Cyrille Lannuier, a daughter whose name is unknown, was born to him and his second wife after 1781. This half-sister is remembered in Charles-Honoré's will made in 1819 in New York.

It should be noted that Lannuier is not by any means a common name, nor are the

Chantilly was known then, as now, for its cream, lace, and medieval fortress of Montmorency, later embellished and called a château by the princely and art-loving Condé family, and today the Musée Condé. This landmark of Chantilly was undoubtedly important in the life of the Lannuier family and gave employment to Charles-Honoré's elder brother Nicolas Lannuier, cabinetmaker, who is known to have supplied some of the château's furnishings.[3] A friend of the Lannuier family, Noel Baufre, was a master joiner, (*maître menuisier*), and it was certainly from these two men that Charles-Honoré learned his skills. How masterful were the skills of Nicolas, and for this reason, how excellent the training of the boy, are revealed in the several existing examples recorded by him. Three are illustrated in Jean Nicolay's *L'Art et La Manière des Maîtres Ebénistes au XVIII Siècle*, a commode is exhibited at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, one splendid desk owned by French and Company of New York, and one or more other pieces are known to French writers but not illustrated in any published source. These pieces display all the talents of the master cabinetmaker: the skillfully made form—conceived both as an object of necessity and of beauty; intricate veneer and marquetry; and the addition of contrasting ornament,—marble, ormolu, and porcelain. In the work of Nicolas Lannuier are foreshadowed the best features of his brother's work; virtuosity in the handling of wood, the masterful interpretation of style, the patient attention to details of finishing, and above all a superb unity of decoration and form.

names which recur in the family genealogy: Casimir, Stanislas, Maximilien, and Auguste, typical given names. Nothing more is known about the Lannuier family in Chantilly and it is possible that they emigrated to France from some other European country, Poland, perhaps, or Austria. There was an influx of middle-European cabinetmakers to France after the marriage of the future Louis XVI to the Austrian princess Marie-Antoinette in 1770, and the Lannuiers may have come at that time. It is interesting to note that the first birth recorded in Chantilly is 1771. The family had contacts in Paris; the elder sons were working there in the 1780's, and by 1791 all the members had removed there. It was probably in that year that twelve year old Charles-Honoré began his training.

[3] Nicolas Lannuier is listed as a cabinetmaker and the brother of Charles-Honoré in the record of a hearing (*procès-verbal*), of June 10, 1793. (Archives de la Seine, records of the Justice de Paix, 10e arrondissement ancien, D 11U1, carton 26). A copy made at the Bibliothèque Nationale is at the Joseph Downs Manuscript Library, Winterthur Museum. He was at least 25 years of age at that time (he is listed as of legal age, 25 in France) and was probably at least 8 years older. He is known to have been admitted to the guild of master-cabinetmakers of Paris, on July 23, 1783, and it was rare for a master to be less than legal age when admitted. The very few details known about Nicolas Lannuier including his manufacture of furniture for the Château of Chantilly, first appeared on Francois Salverte, *Les Ebénistes du XVIII*

Two other brothers of Charles-Honoré figure in his own story. These were Maximilien Auguste and Jean Stanislas Lannuier, both of whom were in New York city in the early 1800's, and probably came here in 1799. Both were associated in a confectionery business for a short time but the premature death of Jean Stanislas from yellow fever in 1805 cut short his career in the New World. Maximilien Auguste was for some years active in New York's Tammany Society and a Mason in the French Lodge until his death in 1811. These two men may have aroused the motive which brought Charles-Honoré to this country or, indeed, he may have accompanied them. However, as the first recorded date of his presence in New York—1804—coincides with the last recorded working date of Nicolas in Paris, it seems plausible to assume that these two dates are in some manner connected. Perhaps Nicolas' death or business failure in 1804 persuaded Charles-Honoré to seek new horizons by joining his brothers in America.

To New York, then, he came, and established his home and workshop in a roomy property at 60 Broad Street: "that spacious and pleasant street running from the Old City Hall to the water." [4] Broad Street was the heart of New York's cabinetmaking district, where the newly arrived cabinetmaker could easily compare and compete with prevailing styles. His house, later described in a number of legal documents, was first rented, and then purchased outright on October 31, 1810 for the sum of $5,900.[5] For the next fifteen years Lannuier's fortunes increased with those of the expanding port to which he had come: a city rapidly becoming the center of America's trade and commerce, described by one English traveller as "the Tyre of the New World." [6]

New York was indeed a thriving center of industry at Lannuier's arrival. The population of 60,515 in 1800 increased to 96,400 by

Siècle (Paris, 1934) and are repeated with illustrations in Jean Nicolay, *L'Art et La Manière des Maîtres Ebénistes au XVIII Siècle* (Paris, 1956).

[4] *Longworth's American Almanac, New York Register, and City Directory* (New York, 1805), p. 74.

[5] New York Hall of Records, Register's Office, Room 205. Liber of Conveyances 91, p. 470 and Liber 288, p. 274. The property had 24½ feet frontage on Broad Street, including half of a four foot alley, and was 70 feet deep. It is stated in the second liber that the family dwelling was in the front of the building and the shop in the rear. In 1833, a third share of the property was sold by Lannuier's son, for $6,566, itself more than the original price of the entire house and an index to increasing real estate values in New York.

[6] John Lambert, *Travels Through Canada and the United States of North America in the Years 1806, 1807 and 1808*, 2 vol. (London, 1814), I, 62.

1810, outstripping Philadelphia and leading the country for the first time. John Lambert, the visitor quoted above, noted that "the people were scampering in all directions to trade with each other, and to ship off their purchases for the European, Asian, African and West Indian markets." "Everything was in motion:" he commented, "all was life, bustle and activity."[7] Among this activity fortunes were made, and, indeed, the wealth realized by New York business in this period is one of the factors to be considered in evaluating the importance of the city as a center of cabinetmaking. New fortunes needed new homes and fine furniture. Merchants had both town houses in the downtown section of New York and country estates further up the island. In voyaging up the East River in 1806 John Melish, another early nineteenth century English traveller, noted that the "banks on each side, . . . [are] adorned with many elegant villas, belonging chiefly to the merchants of New York."[8]

New buildings of all sorts created a market for cabinetwork in New York. Private homes, theatres, eating places, and boarding houses, all required furniture. Public buildings, like the new City Hall built between 1803 and 1812, drew upon the skills of the cabinetmaker. Finally, New Yorkers moved frequently and often refurnished, or, at least, replenished each new home. The city had over 150 cabinetmakers who fulfilled this demand between 1800 and 1820, and it is clear that it was an appropriate milieu for the talents of Charles-Honoré Lannuier.[9]

Two other factors must be explored before discussing the distinctive qualities of the work of Charles-Honoré Lannuier: that is, what styles of furniture was he capable of creating and what modes prevailed in New York upon his arrival? A blanket answer to both these questions would be "Classical," but the variations upon this style are usually called "Louis XVI" in France, "Adam," "Hepplewhite" or "Sheraton" in England and recently "Federal" in America. The style with which Lannuier was most familiar was, of course, the French Louis XVI, associated with the name of the

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 64.

[8] John Melish, *Travels Through the United States of America in the Years 1806 and 1807, and 1809, 1810 and 1811*, 2 vol., 2d ed. (Phil., 1815), I, 67.

[9] This figure was reached by a study based particularly on New York newspapers and directories of the period. The names of 154 men engaged in the production of furniture are known to me, and from further research done since that time I am convinced that the figure is most conservative and was undoubtedly twice as large.

king, because it reached its *apogée* in his reign. The Classical style is, in general, based upon " classic " sources of design, after Greek and Roman models brought to light in the excavations of ancient cities like Pompeii and Herculaneum. It came to favor as a reaction to the flights of the preceding " rococo " style, based chiefly on natural forms such as rocks and shells, and sought again ancient rules of harmony, balance, and proportion, accented with decorative devices also employed by the ancients. In France this style expressed itself in furniture that is light and graceful in form and decorated with carved, inlaid, or more popularly, applied ormolu decoration, based on Greek and Roman patterns; wreaths and rosettes, acanthus leaves and trailing anthemia, Greek key frets and dart moldings, sunbursts and sheaves of wheat, masks and figures of classical mythology.

This style was followed closely by the Empire style, named for Napoleon's rule, but originating in Revolutionary France of the late 18th century. The new style was related to the Classical in its similarly " classic " sources; it used the same decorative motifs and mounts, but applied them instead to more massive, more architectural furniture specifically based on ancient models: to chairs and tables supported by Egyptian sphinxes or Greek and Roman caryatids, and to chests and beds resting on animal-paw or dolphin feet, stained green to resemble the verdigris of excavated furniture. Nicolas Lannuier's known work is in the Louis XVI and early Empire style; similarly, Charles-Honoré Lannuier was well acquainted with, and ready to meet demands for, fine furniture in both the Louis XVI and Empire styles.

In New York in 1800, the Classical style held full sway; the furniture was based more directly, though, on English models created by the architect and decorator Robert Adam and the designers George Hepplewhite and Thomas Sheraton. Delicate chairs with shield shaped backs, graceful serpentine sideboards, elegantly inlaid tables and desks of many varieties, were all made in this style. This was the type of furniture popular in New York city when Lannuier arrived there; his competitor Duncan Phyfe whose name is most frequently associated with this style in New York, was at that very time establishing his own workshop on Partition Street.[10] And for a time Lannuier followed this style,

[10] See Nancy McClelland, *Duncan Phyfe and the English Regency* (New York, 1939). The Phyfe family came from Scotland to America and settled in Albany in

interpreting it always with a distinctively French touch in form and decoration, winning his share of clients, and working soon after in the fully developed Empire style which captured New York and radiated swiftly to all the cities of the Eastern seaboard. His patrons in New York, from his very first years in the city, included the oldest and wealthiest names of the area: Morris, Van Rensselaer, Stuyvesant, Pierrepont, and Pearsall, as well as the city of New York itself, for whom he made a set of chairs for the City Council Room of the new City Hall in 1812.[11] This would seem to reflect Lannuier's growing popularity, his custom techniques, and his fashionable " latest " styles. And his furniture travelled further afield; to the Van Rensselaer Mansion at Albany, to Philadelphia, to Baltimore, to Savannah, and even to the West Indies.[12]

Until recently the known work of Charles-Honoré Lannuier was so limited that it was impossible to speak of the characteristics of his style with any measure of exactness. Fortunately, some fifty examples of his work have now come to light: enough to permit an evaluation of his techniques and abilities. Of course, only a thorough familiarity with as many forms as possible known to have been made by Lannuier can permit one to make any conclusion about the characteristic qualities of his work. It is hoped that the several photographs illustrating this explanation will permit the reader to acquaint himself with Lannuier's manner and to recognize some of the distinctive features of his cabinetwork.

Charles-Honoré Lannuier employed virtually all the techniques of the highly skilled cabinetmaker. Beneath the finely detailed and finished exterior of every object he made is a soundly constructed frame. The construction rarely relies on nails but uses dovetailing and mortise and tenon joints, so well fitted as to be all but invisible. Lannuier finished most of his pieces of furniture on all four sides

1784. Duncan Phyfe worked first as a cabinetmaker in Albany, coming to New York about 1790. After trying several locations, including Broad Street, he settled on Partition (later Fulton) Street about 1804, where he made and supervised the manufacture of furniture in a large workshop for some fifty years until his death in 1856.

[11] These chairs are not known to exist at the present time but the bill for them is recorded in the Minutes of the Common Council of New York.

[12] The inventory of Lannuier's shop made after his death in 1819 included a consignment of $534 worth of furniture for " Trinidad de Cuba," then an important coffee port on the southern coast of the island, and " furniture sent to A. S. Bullock of Savanah [sic] . . . 2401.25." The inventory is at the Downs Manuscript Library, Winterthur Museum.

whether or not they would be seen from all sides. It is characteristic of most cabinetmakers to leave unfinished the back of a bed or pier table that is intended to be placed against a wall. Not so Lannuier. Though it was more costly and not at all imperative to do so, the backs of his beds and pier tables are veneered as carefully as the other three sides and will usually continue the line of metal inlay or decoration that marks the front. Thus, like an object of beautiful sculpture, they may be viewed from any side.

One is never conscious of the construction of a piece of Lannuier furniture because the constructed and the stylistic forms have been so perfectly integrated. Lannuier was not only a superior craftsman, but an artist who saw the greatest aesthetic potentialities of his work and, in choosing to make use of them, achieved a work of art in every piece of usable furniture. A mark of Lannuier's respect for his calling is seen in his construction of card tables. Card tables were often made with a fifth leg which swings around to hold the extended top. When the top is closed, however, the fifth leg gives the table an ungainly look. Lannuier chose the more difficult solution; he constructed his card tables so that the extended top will always rest on some part of the original framing. In the card table at the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum (Fig. 1), the back legs pull out of the frame on sliding supports, which hold the top when open. The tops of Lannuier's card tables supported by winged caryatids (Figures 2 and 3), swing around in a 270° arc and, again, rest on their own underframing. This is also a French characteristic of Lannuier's work; French tables rarely, if ever, have a fifth leg, but rely on some inner means of support.

It is interesting to note that Lannuier appears to have specialized in making tables. He could, and did, make other beautiful forms; the magnificent beds at the Bartow Mansion in New York, and the Albany Institute of History and Art are but two examples of this fact. However, among his known work there is a preponderance of tables, especially card tables and pier tables. This may be partly explained through Lannuier's training. His brother Nicolas is at present not known to have made anything but case pieces: desks, tables, or commodes. This is fully consistent with French tradition, as an *ébéniste* tended to make case pieces, which offer surfaces large enough to be veneered. These would not necessarily all be tables, however, and it may be merely that

Lannuier's tables most suited the popular demand of the time or were thought most worthy of preservation. Time, and a still greater body of Lannuier furniture for study will be necessary to test this hypothesis.

A word must be said about the woods used by Lannuier. The excellence of construction and finishing, the types of furniture made by him, and his style of decoration are all more certain indications of his hand than the woods he used, but they are, nevertheless important. As mahogany was the most popular wood of the Classical and Empire periods in America, most of Lannuier's work is veneered in mahogany. Only the choice of the best veneers, especially rich in color or figure, can be considered distinctive, and the occurrence of mahogany also as a secondary wood (e. g. the underframing of tables, the drawer linings of chests, the inner rails of beds, etc.). Mahogany as a secondary wood is uncommon; it was too costly and unnecessary in " hidden " portions of furniture, and pine, tulip, cedar, or other native products were substituted for the imported wood. It occurs frequently enough in Lannuier's furniture, however, to be considered distinctive of his work.

The use of rarer and more unusual woods as well as rich mahogany may also be considered typical of Lannuier, particularly when used at an early date. The rosewood and ebony inlay on a small satinwood nighttable at the Winterthur Museum, for example, dating about 1805, is appropriate for the style-conscious cabinetmaker, although rosewood was not employed with any frequency in New York before 1820 and is usually associated with Victorian modes after 1840. Two superb Empire pier tables by him (at the Metropolitan and Brooklyn Museums) dating probably after 1810, are made entirely of rosewood. Finally, there is the use of bird's eye maple veneer. Bird's eye maple (*l'érable moucheté*), was one of the most favored woods for Empire furniture in France. Lannuier used it more sparingly but with as great effect. His bed at the Albany Institute, for example, is a splendid example of such veneer, with the elegant contrast of color and texture of amber maple panelled side rails against head and foot boards of dark swirling mahogany.

An unfailing characteristic of Lannuier's work involves his sense of good design and proportion in furniture. The examples illustrated here of Lannuier's work in the Classical and Empire styles

illuminate this point. The Winterthur Museum card table (Fig. 1), and its twin at the Metropolitan Museum are graceful interpretations of the Louis XVI style. This style at its best is exceedingly light and delicate, but only the most skillful cabinetmaker could achieve this effect in a functional object such as a table. Lannuier gave this table an especially poised look by using fluted tapering legs to achieve a feeling of lightness. The width of the skirt is proportioned to the length of the legs in a subtle manner, producing an appearance of stability tempered by grace. A note of contrast in color and texture is struck by the ormolu mounts; the center ornament, fittingly depicting a god of classical mythology framed on either side by a Greek palmette, is nicely scaled to the size of the table, and the two small wreaths at either corner repeat and relate the curved turnings of the legs to the round candleholders of the table top.[13] This same tall slender appearance, usually brought about by reeding or fluting of tapering legs, and contrasting inlaid or applied ornament, mark all of Lannuier's work in the Classical style.

In interpreting the Empire style Lannuier again proved himself a master of the art of cabinetmaking. The key to the finest expression of this style is a feeling of strength and dignity achieved by skillful use of wood and ornament: the latter including marble, mirror, and ormolu. The full body of Lannuier's work includes all these features; for the purpose of this essay, one table in the Empire style, made originally for Stephen Van Rensselaer, the last Patroon of the Manor, and now at the Albany Institute of History and Art is illustrated in Figure 2. This labelled example is one of some half dozen signed pieces very similar in form, different only in details of finishing and ornament. It seems to have been one of Lannuier's most popular and creative patterns and at this moment no similar work is known by any other American cabinetmaker.

It is made of highly figured mahogany, neatly finished and rewarding to look at from all sides. Indeed, this is one of Lannuier's most dramatic uses of the caryatid figure. Seen from the side the winged woman appears to be in flight and gives an amazing sense of vitality and motion to an essentially earthbound

[13] *or molu*, literally " molded gold," is the French term describing objects of gilt brass. The gilt of true ormolu, was a bath of real gold, fused or bonded to the brass beneath with mercury, which gave it is distinctive brilliance.

Fig. 1. Card table in the Classical or Louis XVI style, labeled and stamped by Charles-Honoré Lannuier. Mahogany with ormolu mounts, 1804-1810. Courtesy of the Henry Francis Dupont Winterthur Museum.

Fig. 2. Card table in the Empire style labeled by Lannuier, one of a pair which belongd originally to Stephen Van Rensselaer of Albany. Mahogany with gilt caryatid and ormolu mounts, c. 1810. Courtesy of the Albany Institute of History and Art.

Fig. 3. Card table attributed to Lannuier, one of a pair which belonged originally to James Bosley of Baltimore. Mahogany with gilt caryatid and ormolu mounts, c. 1810. Courtesy of the Maryland Historical Society.

Fig. 4. Settee or window seat attributed to Charles-Honoré Lannuier. Part of the set owned originally by James Bosley. Mahogany with gilt caryatids, c. 1810. Courtesy of the Maryland Historical Society.

Fig. 5. Armchair from the Bosley group attributed to Lannuier. Mahogany with gilt caryatids and ormolu mount, c. 1810. Courtesy of the Maryland Historical Society.

Fig. 6. Matching side chair from the Bosley group attributed to Lannuier. Mahogany with ormolu mount, c. 1810. Courtesy of the Maryland Historical Society.

object. It is important to note also in this table as in many others that Lannuier used purposeful ornament; the animal paw feet with acanthus leaf carving support the base of the table, while the winged female caryatid and lotus-like columns actually support the top. Too often, meaningless columns and caryatids were introduced into Empire furniture. Lannuier understood that their real purpose, as in architecture, is to support weight. The caryatids of many varieties which support his superb card and pier tables fulfill both a structural and decorative function. Furthermore, these caryatids, usually gilt, whether imported from France or carved in Lannuier's shop have at this moment not been associated with the name of any other cabinetmaker and are a distinctive feature of his work.[14] As in his Classical furniture Lannuier introduces also smaller decorative motifs to contrast and relieve the larger shapes. The central ormolu mount of crossed rose branches and the smaller stylized bands of leaves at the corners and base are necessary resting points for the eye, otherwise fatigued by plain wood surfaces, and complete the artistic integration of form and decoration.

The similarity of the table shown in Figure 3 will be noted immediately upon comparing with the Albany card table of Figure 2, discussed above. This card table, also one of a pair, is part of a splendid ensemble of Empire furniture at the Maryland Historical Society. The set consists of these two tables, two arm chairs, two side chairs, and two settees (Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6), which were all originally owned by James Bosley,[15] Baltimore merchant and shipper of the early 19th century, and given to the Society by his nephew James Bosley Noel Wyatt. Whether Mr. Bosley purchased the furniture in New York or imported it himself is unknown; either alternative is possible. On the basis of the distinctive features of this set, it is now attributed to Charles-Honoré Lannuier. Happily, the furniture has remained in Baltimore and is at this writing, the only work of Lannuier known in the city.

[14] John or Jean Lannuier, Charles-Honoré's nephew, and son of Maximilien Auguste, was listed as "Lannuier, John, carver, 69 Eldridge," in *Longworth's Directory* of 1820-1821. Following the French tradition he may have first been apprenticed to his uncle and worked in his shop. In that event he may have carved the caryatids in question.

[15] James Bosley (c. 1779-1843), of Fayette and Calvert Streets, Baltimore. He married Elizabeth Noel in 1822. A third armchair, presented to the Maryland Historical Society by Mrs. Gerald Hoare-Smith, was recently added to the ensemble. It, too, belonged originally to James Bosley, and was given by his nephew, James Bosley Noel Wyatt, to William Nolting, the father of the donor.

The similarity of the two tables, is, it is hoped, almost too striking, to need further comment, particularly when one recalls that Lannuier alone is known to have signed other virtually identical examples. The form of the base, the top, the columnar supports, and winged caryatids, are closely related to Figure 2. And happily enough the applied central mount of a classical figure is identical to that on the Classical card table (Cf. Fig. 1). This additionally conclusive feature is important also in illustrating the hypothesis noted earlier of the continuity of decoration in the Classical and Empire styles. The band of metal inlay which rims the top of the card table is another distinctive feature of Lannuier's work, to be discussed below. The settee shows again the characteristic winged caryatids at either side, and relates to other features of signed Lannuier furniture as well. Black and gilt dolphin feet, for example, support the bed at the Albany Institute discussed earlier, and columns like those at the back, ringed with ormolu at top and base appear on many objects including the bed at Bartow Mansion, and a dressing chest owned by Mr. and Mrs. John E. McCracken of New York.

The chairs (Figs. 5 and 6) repeat the distinctive decorative features of the tables and settees. The caryatids support the arm rests, while ormolu rosettes rest in the corners of the curved seat rail, a device used also in the front of each arm rest on the settees. A gleaming ormolu mount, a bow knot with crossed branches of roses ornaments the crest rail, a mount identical to that on the labelled card table of Figure 2, and framed by two delicate lines of metal inlay. The side chair has also a tiny band of metal inlay in an unusual fleur-de-lis pattern, above the strings of the lyre splat; this band is missing from the armchair but has left an identical impress there. This superb group includes the only chairs and settees which can presently be called Lannuier (no signed chairs are known) and forms in itself, a beautiful and important Lannuier collection in Baltimore.

The final mark of Lannuier's workmanship to be discussed in detail is his decoration—perhaps most characteristic of all. This decoration is of three varieties: inlaid, carved, and applied. Lannuier knew how to use inlay of different wood as in the banding of the top and drawers of the nighttable mentioned earlier, the leaf or flower motifs at either side of a Classical pier table at the Winterthur Museum, and floral medallions on a small

occasional table made originally for Commodore Richard Valentine Morris of New York. However, there is not enough of this inlaid wood decoration to judge its distinct qualities, as there is not a large group of Lannuier's work in the Classical style to evaluate. Most of his presently known furniture is in the Empire style which called for applied decoration rather than wood inlay. Only the fact that the inlay is of rosewood or ebony on an object in the Classical style, might point to Lannuier's craftsmanship as discussed above.

An excellent and most distinctive hallmark of Lannuier's workmanship is the metal inlay banding on tables, beds, and chairs. (Cf. Figs. 3, 5, and 6.) The inlay was probably ordered from France in strips and like wood inlay, was glued carefully into a depression planed for it, flush with the wood veneer. The inlay is always black and gold, in patterns of great refinement: Greek key frets, egg and dart motifs, and many other classical designs. The motif is always small and discreet, and there is a great variety of patterns, several sometimes appearing on a single object. Four types of this inlay, for example, band the panels of bird's eye maple on the bed at the Albany Institute. Lannuier's use of metal inlay cannot be definitely catalogued because he used so many patterns; he almost never repeated one type; seemingly he delighted in individualizing each piece of furniture he created in this manner.

The metal inlay appears in single motifs as well as bands or strips, and always in Classical patterns; the card table owned by Mrs. John de Witt Peltz, for example, and for some time exhibited at the Museum of the City of New York, has inlay in the shape of stars, flowers, urns, and lyres, along the skirt and base. The distinctive qualities of this inlay can best be understood by seeing as many of the different patterns as possible and by comparing the stencilled imitations on some pieces of American Empire furniture. Both metal inlay and applied ormolu decoration which mark the French Empire style were copied by painted stencilling in America, but the effect of the bolder color and shape of the painted ornament, as well as its flatness of plane, is not as pleasing as the small scaled metal inlay, and the three-dimensional sculptural quality of the cast metal mount.

Lannuier's carved decoration is more distinctive in form than in technique. He was fond of winged caryatid figures to support

his tables, as discussed above, and several different varieties of these figures are known. Similarly he used boldly cut, naturalistic dolphins, and animal-paw feet with acanthus carved " knees " to support many case pieces. Freestanding columns of richly figured wood with ormolu capitals and bases in delicately chased patterns are also seen in his work as well as the distinctive lotus or tulip-like colonnettes seen in Figures 2 and 3. The carved figures used by Lannuier were usually gilt and also painted either black, or coppery green to resemble the *vert antique* or verdigris found on archaeological excavations.

The applied ornaments used by Lannuier are again distinctive but difficult to particularize because of their variety. The most typical are the quarter round metal edgings found around the rims of card tables and pier tables and marking the panels of beds. The Classical card table of Figure 1 has these gilt brass edgings outlining its skirt. This is most unusual on American furniture of the period. Similarly the ormolu mounts are exceptional and rarely found on American furniture. These mounts were imported from France; brasses so thin and delicate, yet complex in form, were not yet made in America in the early nineteenth century. The casting of these beautiful and highly individual mounts, which were in turn chased and gilded, was a skilled craft with a long tradition of its own in France, and, indeed, the mounts were usually the most expensive single components of a piece of French furniture. The use of gilt brass mouldings and ormolu mounts of exceptionally fine quality is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of Lannuier's work.

As with his metal inlay Lannuier rarely used the same mount twice. The case of the central mount of the table at the Maryland Historical Society (Fig. 3) which is identical to the ornament on the card table (Fig. 1), and that of the matching Maryland chair whose mount is identical to that on the Albany table (Fig. 2), is a happy coincidence which figures in the attribution of these objects to Lannuier. Several other mounts are repeated, and two particularly distinctive ones are similar, on tables at the Metropolitan and Brooklyn Museums, respectively. These are the figures of a classical personage, possibly Apollo, in a chariot drawn by winged insects resembling bees; this scene may be an allegory in which Napoleon is depicted as Apollo, for one of the personal symbols of the French Emperor was the bee, and as such it figured

often in the decorative arts of his reign. A mount identical to that on Lannuier's pier table at the Metropolitan Museum appears on a French Empire pier table at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs.[16]

One of the most characteristic features of Lannuier's work and again one of the most difficult to define concerns the craftsman's attention to small details. In this case, these are details of finishing rather than construction. The Winterthur Museum card table (Fig. 1) exhibits a number of these niceties of finishing. The round depressions for candleholders seem more suited to the Classical style than the usual square variety, and the rich wine-colored felt cover, with its gilt leather border stamped with a Greek key fret, is a welcome change from the common green baize. Similarly, the card tables supported by caryatids (Figs. 2 and 3) have velvet lined depressions along the inner rim of the top upon which it revolves to open noiselessly. The chessboard which forms part of the Lannuier gaming table at the Museum of the City of New York is inlaid on both sides although one side would have served as well. These were the extra details which only the most advanced *ébéniste* would have felt it necessary to include.

At this moment three Lannuier labels and at least two stamps are known. Two of the labels are printed and are quite simple in form, dating probably from the early period of Lannuier's work, 1804-1810. Another more elaborate engraved label set in the shape of an Empire cheval glass, may date from the period after 1810 when Lannuier, with increased prosperity, could have afforded the luxury and greater expense of engraving. This is, generally speaking, borne out by existing labels on Lannuier pieces; the objects in the earlier Classical style have the printed label, while pieces in the Empire style exhibit the engraved one. One of the printed labels, and the engraved version, carry the advertisement of the cabinetmaker's talents in French as well as English. The continuance of the French translation is a mark of the *bon ton* which accompanied both the French language and fashions in early 19th century New York.[17] Lannuier also stamped his full name on

[16] Illustrated in *Les Nouvelles Collections de l'Union Centrale des Arts Décoratifs au Palais du Louvre. Pavillon de Marsan. Serie no. 8. Suite de Mobilier* (Paris, 19[?], Plate 108.

[17] The engraved label bears the following inscriptions in elegant flowing script and English which suggests that the engraver was one of Lannuier's fellow-emigrés: H[ry] LANNUIER/ CABINETMAKER FROM PARIS/ KIPS IS WHARE HOUSE OF/ NEW FASHION FOURNITURE/ BROAD'S STREET, NO. 60/ NEW

his furniture in the French manner: his *estampille* includes his adopted city of New York as well as his own name. The reason for the addition of the city is not certain, unless Lannuier was particularly proud of his new home, or wished to inform customers in the distant cities he supplied of his address.

Charles-Honoré Lannuier's love of cabinetmaking is everywhere apparent in his preserved works. The many details which have been noted give a greater picture of his comprehension of form, function, and style in furniture. Lannuier made usable furniture, so well made that it has endured and is still in use today. His knowledge of construction was so sure that no details of the manufacture of an object intrude themselves into the enjoyment of the form. Instead a perfect unity of form and decoration is achieved. Lannuier's knowledge of style was similarly comprehensive and first-hand. His work in the Classical style is light and graceful in form; restrained in ornament. The Empire style is expressed in its greatest nobility. The grain of beautiful wood is contrasted against white marble and reflected in mirror; the dignified and handsome forms are emphasized by gleaming ormolu mounts.

It should be noted that in form and ornament Lannuier's work is, on the whole, more restrained than the work of his contemporaries in France. This may be due either to Lannuier's own interpretation of the style or to suit the tastes of his American customers. A striking fact emerges from a prolonged study of Empire furniture; the gulf between the very good and the very bad seems wider than in any other style. While in the Queen Anne and Chippendale styles of the 18th century, country furniture or furniture by lesser city craftsmen often has great simplicity and charm, similar furniture in the Empire style is sometimes heavy, crude, and overdone. The Empire style required a comprehensive knowledge of the forms and decoration of the classical era and a mere combination of copied details falls far short of what was intended by the originators of the style. The work of Lannuier, then, may be used as an example of what is good and beautiful in the Empire style in America, and serves as a standard for all furniture in this manner.

YORK/ H^{RE} LANNUIER/ EBENISTE DE PARIS/ TIENT FABRIQUE &/ MAGASIN DE MEUBLES/ LES PLUS A LA MODE/ NEW YORK./

Charles-Honoré Lannuier died in New York City on October 16, 1819 at the untimely age of 40. Unfortunately, neither of his two sons followed the father's craft.[18] The skills which Lannuier brought to this country died with him, but his French tradition exerted a profound influence on the fashions of New York in the early nineteenth century. Only his works, a growing number of which are now known to have been preserved, appropriately exhibited and valued, speak of the brief but telling career of this *maître-ébéniste* who belongs both to France and to America.

[18] Charles-Honoré Lannuier was married, either in France or in New York, to Thérèse Baptiste. Three children are known to have been born to them, Stanislas Mortimer, Sophia, and Charles-Ansore. The last named was born in 1816 and probably died soon after for he is not named in Charles-Honoré's careful will of 1819. Both Stanislas and Sophia died at early ages, and although their children were working in New York in the 1860's and 1870's no descendants have been traced.

THE GREAT SEAL DEPUTED OF MARYLAND

By Peter Walne

IN his paper *The Great Seal of Maryland*, published in the Peabody Fund Series in 1886, Clayton C. Hall dealt with the successive Great Seals of the proprietary province, royal colony and independent state of Maryland. This present article confines itself to an account of the Great Seals Deputed of Maryland during the years 1692-1715, when the proprietary government was displaced by royal government, and attempts to correct certain misunderstandings in Hall's paper and to amplify his brief account of these seals—of which there were three, not two. With the Great Seals of the Proprietors and of the State, this article is not concerned. The writer's interest in this limited aspect of the sigillographic history of Maryland must be excused on the ground that he is preparing a detailed study of the Great Seals Deputed of the British Colonies, past and present. It is as a partial result of this work that a reassessment of the seals of royal government in Maryland can be written.[1]

When, in 1692, the authority of the Proprietor of the colony was replaced by that of the Crown, exercised through the office of a Governor and Captain General, the Great Seal of the Colony was one of those things which most sharply reflected the changed

[1] A recent detailed study of *The Great Seal Deputed of Virginia*, by the present writer, appeared in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, LXVI (January, 1958), 1-21.

The term "Great Seal Deputed" is used in English seal nomenclature to denote those seals which, over the course of centuries, have taken the place of the one Great Seal of the realm for the authentication of documents, which at one time would have been authenticated by the Great Seal itself. As government became more complex and its ramification more widespread, the use of the one Great Seal became impossible and so other seals fulfilled its tasks, some of them specifically being called [Great] Seals Deputed for particular business. Of this category of seal, those for use in the British colonies show the widest divergence from the traditional pattern of Great Seals and are probably the most interesting of them all. The use of the term in connection with the Maryland seals, is useful in that it establishes a differentiation between the Great Seal of proprietorial government and the Great Seal Deputed of royal government with some precision.

THE GREAT SEAL DEPUTED OF MARYLAND, 1691/92

order. Now that writs ran in the King's name, proclamations and laws, grants of land and office requiring authentication could not be so authenticated by the Proprietor's Great Seal. In its place was substituted, as happened in all colonies governed by the Crown through a Governor, a Great Seal Deputed, a class of off-shoot from the Great Seal of England, which gave the necessary authentication to all such documents as customarily and traditionally passed under the Proprietor's Great Seal to give them legal validity. Of the detailed history of these seals not a great deal is known, although the materials for a detailed study exist in profusion in the Public Record Office and Royal Mint in London and in the archives and other records of the colonies, past or present.

It would seem that Hall in his brief account of the Great Seal Deputed of the period of royal government misunderstood the sequence of events, which surrounded the issue of the seal for Maryland in 1692 and, as a result, reverses their order and significance. It is not strictly true to say, as he does, that the seal was adopted "but . . . not . . . without the direct sanction of royal authority."[2] The Crown having assumed control of the government, it would be necessary for a royal seal of dignity to be sent to replace that of the former government and the Council did not really "adopt" this seal, with or without the scant formality, which Hall conjectures. The seal was sent to be used as an essential part of government and administration and the Council had to accept it. It might be useful at this stage to reconstruct the sequence of events, which led up to the issue of this first Great Seal Deputed, a reconstruction based on practice known to be followed in the next reign and almost certain to have been followed in 1691-2.

What, in effect, would have happened prior to the dispatch of the seal is roughly this: on learning that the province was to be placed under royal government, an Order in Council would be sent to the Board of Trade and Plantations authorising the making of a seal for the colony and instructing the Board to take steps for its preparation. The Board would then call in and instruct the Chief Graver of Seals to prepare the matrices of the seal after the lines of a design discussed between them, the instructions being in the form of a warrant of the Board in which the seal would be described. Eventually, the Graver produced the matrices before the

[2] Hall, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-5.

Board, where they would be approved and transmitted to the Privy Council for further approval along with a draft of the warrant to Governor Copley for the use of the seal. Having received the Council's approval and the warrant for use having been duly signed, both would be returned to the Board and from thence transmitted to the colony.

Since the first seal for Maryland was issued out of sequence and not at the beginning of the reign when the Graver of Seals would have an extensive range of new matrices for the numerous departments of state and the judiciary, besides personal royal seals, to engrave, the whole procedure would be much quicker than normally was the case. By 7 January 1691/2, the seal was ready and the warrant to Governor Copley drafted and signed ready for despatch.[8]

In the warrant, the first of the Great Seals Deputed for Maryland—the first of three, not two as Hall says—is clearly described. It was double-sided, bearing on the one side the royal cypher (i. e., the letters WMR entwined) surmounted by a crown, the legend *Sigillum Provinciae de Maryland in America* running around the circumference. On the other side were the royal arms (i. e., the Stuart arms with an escutcheon of pretence centrally placed, for Nassau, impaling, again, the Stuart arms), the shield surrounded by the Garter ribbon bearing the motto of the Order, *Honi Soit Qui Mal Y Pense*, the lion and unicorn supporters, one each side of the shield, and a royal crown surmounting the whole. In a ribbon beneath the shield was the royal motto, *Dieu et Mon Droit.* Surrounding the whole was the legend bearing the royal titles *Gulielmus III. et Maria II. Dei Gratia. Mag. Britt. Fran. et Hiber. Rex et Regina. Fidei Defensores.* The two matrices were of silver and the engraving was the work of Henry Harris, at that time Chief Graver of Seals to the Crown. From a copy of Harris's account for the work in the records of the Royal Mint, it appears that his charge for engraving the matrices was £50, £30 less than the £80 charged for engraving the double-matrix seals of New York and the Leeward Islands earlier in the reign (no doubt the less intricate design of the Maryland seal would account for the lower charge). 38 ozs. of silver went into the matrices at a cost of £10-2-8 and a steel seal press, to enable impressions of the

[8] Hall, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-8, prints the warrant in full.

seal to be made and affixed to documents, was supplied at the same time at a cost of £10.[4] The Treasury eventually authorised payment of Harris's bill and the money would be recovered, through the Colony's London Agent.

The seal arrived in the colony in the late summer or early fall of 1692 and on October 1, 1692, receipt and adoption was formally acknowledged by the Council sitting in the City of St. Mary.[5] The diplomatic of the Great Seal Deputed of Maryland (and indeed of the Proprietor's Great Seal) is a subject which awaits closer scrutiny in the records of Maryland and in records in the Public Record Office in London. Such a search would no doubt produce tangible results but this paper, and the writer's work so far, has of necessity been confined simply to the history of the seals as tangible objects, the much wider field of their use awaits exploration.

On the death of Mary II in 1694, there was no general issue of new seals for the colonies in William's name alone. This, possibly also on grounds of economy, was almost certainly because William and Mary were joint rulers (not sovereign and consort) and Mary's death did not result in a demise of the Crown, which would, amongst other things, have meant new seals. In March, 1697/8, the only move which might have been occasioned by Mary's death as far as colonial seals were concerned was when the Board of Trade and Plantations conducted an investigation into the designs and legends of seals in use. From this it appeared that the Virginian seal was that issued in 1662 for Charles II, that for Bermuda was the one issued in 1684 for James II and New Hampshire had no seal; the remainder were the current ones for William and Mary's reign.[6] New seals for these three were ordered and were the only three issued for the colonies in William's name alone.[7]

[4] Royal Mint Record Book, VII, 1699-1728, 74-5. The office of Graver of the Seal was not on the establishment of the Royal Mint but was a separate office, to which appointment was made by Royal Warrant. The Graver presented his bill for colonial seals to the Board of Trade and Plantations who then, after approving the charges, passed it to the Treasury. The Treasury then submitted it to the Master and other officers of the Mint, asking them to certify the correctness and reasonableness of the charges. Hence the information being in the Mint records, where it is more easily accessible, as well as in the Treasury records, where it is less so.

[5] Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[6] *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies, 1697/8*, p. 127 (hereafter cited as *Cal. S. P. Col., A. & W. I.*).

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

With the death of William III in 1702, the machinery for the issue of new seals once more went into operation. On 13 April, 1702, a royal warrant was sent to each colonial governor authorising the continued use of the old seal until such time as the new one should be received. On 31 May an Order in Council under sign manual, directed to the Board of Trade and Plantations ordered new seals to be prepared, the Lord High Treasurer would arrange to meet the charges and the seals when ready were to be laid before the Queen in Council. This order was received by the Board on 8 June and instructions were given to Harris, still Chief Graver of Seals (as well as Yeoman of the Revels, a mildly lucrative but not particularly onerous Household appointment) to do the work.[8]

Some 16 months later, in October 1703, Harris reported to the Board, that although he had made all the new seals for use in the three home kingdoms and some of the colonies, the seals for Jamaica, Barbados, Leeward Islands, Massachusetts Bay and Maryland were still not ready.[9] His illness and subsequent death in the summer of 1704, with only the Leeward's seal finished out of those outstanding, delayed matters even further. On 17 October 1704, Harris's daughter, Mrs. Elizabeth Furnesse, appeared before the Board with the completed Leeward's seal and the half completed New York seal, saying that the rest were in hand and asking for instructions.[10] On 26 October, the Board requested instructions from the Treasury [11] and on 31 October, the Treasury told the Master of the Mint to authorise her to continue with all speed.[12] As Mrs. Furnesse was not appointed Graver of Seals and as no successor to Harris was appointed until March 1704/5, when John Roos succeeded to the office, it must obviously have been thought advisable, in the unusual circumstances, to put her directly under the control of the Mint. On 14 December, Mrs. Furnesse wrote to the Board that the seals for Maryland and New Hampshire were ready and she was ordered to deliver them at once.[13] By 22 December, they were before the Board and the rest

[8] *Ibid.*, 1702, p. 366.
[9] Royal Mint Record Book, VII, 78.
[10] *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations* (hereafter cited as *Journ. T & P.*), I, 50.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[12] *Calendar of Treasury Books*, XIX, 397.
[13] *Cal. S. P. Col., A. & W. I., 1704-5*, p. 338.

promised.[14] By 19 April 1705, with the exception of the Jamaican seal, the remainder were in the Board's hands [15] and on 20 April, seals and draft warrants for use were sent to the Privy Council.[16] On 3 May the Queen signed the warrants for use (later discovered to have one important defect in them),[17] and seals and warrants were returned to the Board for onward transmission. On 8 May, William Popple, Secretary to the Board, sent the North American seals and warrants in two packets to Lieutenant-Governor Nott of Virginia in Portsmouth, about to board the man-o'war *Kingston* to return to America. One packet contained the seal and warrant for Virginia, his own particular concern; the other, the seals and warrants for New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts Bay and Maryland, all consigned to Governor Seymour of Maryland, who would arrange distribution.[18] Nott, acknowledged safe receipt on 19 May,[19] and the seal would be in Maryland in use by the late summer.[20]

The important defect in the Maryland warrant for use, in common with all those signed on 3 May, was the omission of the instruction that the old seal was to be defaced in the presence of the colony's Council and then returned to England for formal defacement in the Privy Council. This additional instruction was sent to Governor Seymour in a letter of July, 1705, reported to the Board of Trade and Plantations on 28 July.[21] It was in response to this that Seymour wrote on 15 August, 1706, returning the old seal of William and Mary,[22] having entrusted it to the care of Evan Evans to carry it to London, where he was to hand it over to Colonel Nathaniel Blakiston, Maryland's Agent in London.[23] Receipt of Seymour's letter was reported to the Council on 25 November 1706 and Blakiston was requested to attend next day to hand over the old seal formally.[24]

[14] *Journ. T. & P.*, I, 76.
[15] *Ibid.*, 128.
[16] *Ibid.*, 129.
[17] *Ibid.*, 132.
[18] *Ibid.*, 134.
[19] *Ibid.*, 139.
[20] Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 25 is wrong in citing the proceedings of the Council of Maryland of 22 September 1706, as evidence of the adoption of this seal. The reference is to the adoption of seals, other than the Great Seal Deputed, for local use and made locally.
[21] *Cal. S. P. Col., A. & W. I., 1704-5*, p. 599.
[22] *Journ. T. & P.*, I, 295.
[23] Evans' receipt for the matrices, ingenuously described as "two pieces of silver plate," is printed in Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
[24] *Journ. T. & P.*, I, 295.

The seal which was sent out to Maryland to replace the first of the Great Seals Deputed was similar in design to its predecessor. On the one side, it bore the royal cypher (A R), surmounted by a crown, the whole surrounded by the legend *Sigillum Provinciae de Maryland in America.* On the other side were the royal arms (i. e., the Stuart arms alone), encircled by the Garter ribbon with motto, the lion and unicorn supporters, the shield surmounted by a crown and the motto *Semper Eadem* in a ribbon beneath the arms. The royal title *Anna Dei Gratia Mag: Brit: Fran: et Hiber: Regina Fidei Defensor* forming the surrounding legend. The matrices this time were made " slightly larger by order " and the engraver's charge was £80, the same sum charged for all double-sided seals of this series.[25] Though larger, less silver was used this time, only 29 ounces 16 pennyweights.[26]

The Act of Union, 1707, by which England and Scotland became one kingdom had, as a by-result, the effect of requiring a completely fresh series of seals, at home and in the colonies, to take account of the change in the royal arms made at this time. On 6 July 1708, the Earl of Sunderland wrote to the Board of Trade and Plantations, asking for details of the designs of current colonial seals so that a warrant could be issued requiring the preparation of a new series bearing the altered royal arms.[27] The same routine of procedure in commissioning, engraving and approving the seals was followed as was the case with the first seals of Anne. The engraver was John Roos, Harris' successor as Chief Graver of Seals to the Queen.

Not until 7 May 1712, almost four years after it was first commissioned was Maryland's third Great Seal Deputed ready, when Roos produced finished seals for Virginia and Maryland for the Board's approval.[28] Draft warrants were ordered the same day and these, together with the seals, were forwarded to the Earl of Dartmouth, Sunderland's successor as Secretary of State for the Southern Department and as such in charge of colonial affairs, for approval, engrossment and signature.[29] The series of colonial seals was not, however, completed until March or April 1713, and despatch of those, including Maryland's, ready earlier was delayed

[25] Royal Mint Record Book, VII, 81.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[27] *Cal. S. P. Col., A. & W. I., 1708-9,* p. 19.
[28] *Journ. T. & P.*, II, 363.
[29] *Ibid.*

until all could be sent at the same time. On 23 April 1713, a letter to Lloyd, President of the Council of Maryland, enclosing the warrant for use and the new seal was signed by the Board of Trade and Plantations and shortly thereafter the seal was despatched.[30]

This second seal of Anne was identical with the first, except for the changed version of the arms, which replaced the old Stuart arms in use since 1603. Roos' charge for engraving the two matrices was £80; the silver (29 ounces 13 pennyweights 12 grams) and a shagreen case, to protect the seal during transit and when not in use, added a further £8:18:4 to the cost.[31]

Although the warrant for use included the instruction to return the old seal for formal defacement, no specific mention of its receipt in England has been noted. It may well be that it was returned and the fact is hidden under a general reference or it is always possible that the eventual return of the reins of government to the Proprietor may have meant that compliance with the instruction was overlooked.

With the resumption of government by the Protestant Lord Baltimore, the Proprietor's Great Seal once more became the Great Seal of the colony and the royal Great Seal Deputed had no further authority. Although but a brief episode in the history of Maryland, the story of its three Great Seals Deputed is worth the telling for its own intrinsic interest. It is to be regretted that, with one exception, no impressions of the seal have yet been found by the writer, which would enable full illustration of the story.

The story of the Proprietors' Great Seal is another matter and to judge from Hall's paper much further research would be needed to establish the sequence of seals and details of their making and transmission to Maryland. The records which provide the story of the royal Great Seal Deputed are not likely to provide the story of the Proprietors' seals. Perhaps some day sufficient can be gleaned to add materially to what Hall has to tell, it would be worth the telling.

[30] *Ibid.*, 424-5.
[31] Royal Mint Record Book, VII, p. 93.

SIDELIGHTS

THE COURT INQUIRES ABOUT A GHOST

KENNETH L. CARROLL

In Queen Anne's County, Maryland, at the end of the eighteenth century a civil suit was tried which, except for one curious aspect, would have been little different from countless others. This particular case became celebrated, however, because of the testimony of one of the witnesses concerning a ghostly interested party. Out of the court's proceedings came a pamphlet with the intriguing title "Authentic Account of the Appearance of a Ghost in Queen Ann's County, Maryland." [1] The story revealed in this pamphlet—the only extant record of the case—is fascinating but unfinished, for the court's decision is nowhere revealed.

The story really begins twenty-odd years before its climax, for several of the leading figures served in the Revolutionary War in the same military unit; and one of them began, during that war, the chain of circumstances which made the story possible. Thomas Harris, the main character in the story—in death as in life—had been one of the first in the state to respond to his country's call.[2] So had his brother James, whose widow Mary was now being sued as the administratrix of James's estate.[3] William Briggs, a lifelong friend of Thomas Harris and the chief witness in the trial, served in the same military organization with these two.[4] It also appears that Robert Wright, counsel for the plaintiffs and later governor of Maryland, was a member of this "Minute Company that march'd from Queen Anns County, Maryland, the 3d Feby., 1776" to the Eastern Shore of Virginia—a move designed to keep the local Tories under the leadership of Lord Dunmore, governor of Virginia, from causing trouble.[5] The few months which these men spent in service together must have produced a deep effect upon them and on their friendship through the years.

[1] The full title is "Authentic Account of the Appearance of a Ghost in Queen Ann's County, Maryland: Proved in said County Court in the remarkable Trial—State of Maryland, use of JAMES, FANNY, ROBERT, and THOMAS HARRIS, Devissees of THOMAS HARRIS, versus MARY HARRIS, Administratrix of JAMES HARRIS" (Baltimore, 1807). This pamphlet, hereafter referred to as *Appearance of a Ghost*, is extremely rare. The Library of Congress does not possess it, but a copy can be found in the New York Public Library, as well as in the M. H. S.

[2] *Arch. Md.*, XVIII, 645.

[3] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 67, 120, 375, 408, 645.

[4] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 50, 190, 309, 645.

[5] Frederic Emory, *Queen Anne's County, Maryland: Its Early History and Development* (Baltimore, 1950), p. 283. This work hereafter referred to as *Queen Anne's County*. See also *Arch. Md.*, XVIII, 645.

Unlike his brother James, Thomas Harris does not seem to have devoted many months to the Revolutionary army. It would appear that he returned home and resumed farming after this one period of service. Little is known about him, but it can probably be said with truth that he was something of a "man about town."

Whatever his true character, in the 1780's Thomas formed a rather close attachment for Ann Goldsborough—so that there resulted from this relationship four children: James, Fanny, Robert, and Thomas. All four of them were too young to be self-supporting when their father died in the fall of 1791. However, in his will, of August 25th of that year, Thomas Harris decreed that his real and personal property

> . . . be sold vandue and that twenty pounds Current money . . . be paid yearly to the seport of my four children begotten of Ann Gouldsborough—that is to say James Thomas Fanne Robert till they come to the age of seven years old and the Rest of the Money to be Equally Divided Between my four Children James Thomas Fanne Robert.[6]

His brother James was appointed his "hol and sowl" executor.

In due time James Harris caused the will to be probated and took the necessary steps to serve as executor. After making an inventory of the estate, he arranged a sale of the land which his brother had held and which James thought the will authorized him to sell. However, when the lawyer handling the transfer examined the title to the land, he made a surprising discovery: the property had not been held in fee, as had been thought by all concerned, but had been entailed.[7]

This finding was of two-fold importance. It was agreed that Thomas Harris, who "was not seized in fee, but in tail, of the land," had no right to devise it. Of more importance was the fact that the property could not descend to Thomas's children because of their illegitimacy. James Harris, the executor of his brother's will, was the "heir in tail." The land belonged to James in his own right—as the next legitimate heir—and he promptly conveyed his rights to the purchaser, keeping the money for himself.[8]

Just about two years after this unexpected turn of events James Harris died intestate. His widow, Marry Harris, was appointed administratrix of his estate. This, in turn, led to still another development. A suit was brought on her administration bond—seeking to recover the estate of her deceased brother-in-law, Thomas Harris, for the use of the illegitimate children to whom Thomas had willed all of his estate.[9]

This action, brought for the benefit of the children of Thomas Harris and Ann Goldsborough, was taken to court in 1798 or 1799. Since

[6] This will is located in the Queen Anne's County Wills, Liber SC No. 7, folio 306. Probated on October 11, 1791, this document was witnessed by Thomas Wilcoks and James and John Meradith, sons of Thomas Meradith.

[7] *Appearance of a Ghost*, p. 3. It should be noted that this pamphlet mistakenly dates Thomas Harris' death in 1790, one year too early.

[8] *Appearance of a Ghost*, p. 4.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

there exists a gap in the Queen Anne's County records for this period, our information concerning the trial comes to us through the exceedingly rare pamphlet dealing with the County's ghost.

One thing of interest about the case is that a number of very important people were connected with the trial. The judge was James Tilghman—a member of one of the Eastern Shore's better-known families and chief justice of the second judicial district comprising Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, and Talbot Counties.[10] Robert Wright and Joseph H. Nicholson were the counsel for the plaintiffs. Robert Wright later became United States Senator from Maryland, and in the fall of 1806 he was elected governor of Maryland by the legislature.[11] Joseph H. Nicholson represented Queen Anne's County in the state legislature in 1796, 1797, and 1798.[12]

Richard Tilghman Earle and John Scott were the counsel for the defendant. When James Tilghman, judge of the second district died on April 19, 1809, Earle was appointed in his place on May 20, 1809.[13] John Scott, a Revolutionary War veteran,[14] was not as prominent as the other lawyers involved in this case.

According to our one account of the trial, based upon "attested notes, taken in court at the time by one of the council," the counsel on both sides agreed before the jury was sworn that the only thing which could be recovered was the balance of Thomas Harris's personal estate: in the first instance, "the land was entailed. Secondly—Because if it had been a fee simple estate no person was appointed by the will to make sale of the land. The testator had directed it to be sold, and no doubt believed that his executor would be authorised to make sale of it." [15]

According to our source there appears to have been another motive, besides the welfare of the children, guiding some of the people involved. For some time rumors had circulated that the ghost of Thomas Harris had frequently appeared to William Briggs during the lifetime of James Harris. These appearances, according to common report, were designed to make James return the proceeds of the sale to the orphan's court for the use of the four small children whom Thomas had left. Many people wanted to hear these extraordinary stories, circulating freely throughout the countryside, repeated and sworn to under oath.[16]

William Briggs, it is recorded, "was known to be a man of character, of firm, undaunted spirit; had been a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and perfectly disinterested between and unconnected with the parties." [17]

[10] Emory, *Queen Anne's County*, p. 132.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 37. In April, 1806, while he was still in the Senate, he was selected "Attorney General, vice William Pinkney" but declined the appointment.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 367. He is remembered for having voted, in 1797, against the bill for universal suffrage, "because it included free blacks as well as white, and he would never consent to give the negro a participation in government." The next year, 1798, Nicholson introduced a bill to extend suffrage to all white citizens without any property qualifications. This law went into effect in 1803.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 382.

[14] *Arch. Md.*, XVIII, *passim.*

[15] *Appearance of a Ghost*, p. 5.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

He had served in the Minute Company that was rushed from Queen Anne's County to Northampton Courthouse in 1776.[18] Later, on July 24, 1776, he enrolled in the Flying Camp.[19] As a private he served from June 6, 1778, to March 30, 1779, and was with Captain Jonathan Morris's company of the 7th Maryland Regiment at White Plains on September 9, 1778.[20] It should be noted that, despite the above statement of his disinterest in the "parties," William Briggs had been a lifelong friend of Thomas Harris and had attended Harris at the time of his death.

Because of the widely spread rumors about the ghost, the court called William Briggs as a witness. Briggs, who was forty-three years old at the time of the trial, stated that on a very clear day in the March following the death of Thomas Harris he was riding alone on a horse which had belonged to the deceased. Sometime between eight and nine o'clock in the morning, and just after he crossed a small branch, his horse started moving rapidly and then entered a lane bordering the field where Harris's grave was located. The horse "suddenly wheeled in a pannel of the fence, looked over the fence into the field where Thomas Harris was buried . . . and neighed very loud." [21] Briggs testified that he was sure the horse recognized its former master.

Briggs, who said that he "was acquainted with Thomas Harris when a boy and there had been great intimacy between them," reported that he then saw Thomas Harris coming toward him. Just before the apparition reached the fence, on this first appearance, it turned to the right and disappeared. Briggs did not see the thing's features nor did he speak to it, even though "T. Harris came within two pannels of the fence to him." [22] The spectre was dressed in the same clothes that Harris had worn the last time that Briggs had seen him alive. It always wore the same apparel, according to Briggs, whenever it appeared.

Several months later, one evening at dusk about the first of June, Thomas Harris's ghost appeared a second time. This time Briggs was plowing some three miles from the place where the grave was located. The ghost, dressed as before, came within two steps of Briggs and walked alongside him for about two hundred yards. Meanwhile, a young man, who was plowing along with Briggs, came up and the ghost disappeared—with no apparent motion of any particular part of his body. The helper did not see the ghost, and Briggs made no mention of what had taken place.[23]

After Briggs had gone to bed that night several unusual things happened. A loud groan was heard, but when Mrs. Briggs searched the house nothing could be found. Later, when Briggs was asleep, he received a blow that blackened his eyes and caused his nose to swell. Neither his

[18] *Arch. Md.*, XVIII, 645; Emory, *Queen Anne's County*, pp. 283-284.

[19] *Arch. Md.*, XVIII, 50.

[20] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 190. The jacket to his file, showing his presence at White Plains, is preserved at the National Archives in Washington.

[21] *Appearance of a Ghost*, p. 6.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

wife, who was in bed with him, nor two young men who were in the room were awake at the time. Briggs was convinced that no person in the room had struck him.[24]

Another two and a half months passed before the next recorded appearance of Harris' ghost. Toward the middle of August, about an hour after nightfall, William Briggs was on his way home when Harris's figure approached him and extended his weightless arm over Brigg's shoulder. The phantom said nothing, finally disappeared, and Briggs, "much alarmed," made his way to a neighbor's place and got a young man to go home with him.[25]

In October the ghost appeared three times in one morning. At dawn Briggs saw his former friend about one hundred yards from the house and about fifty yards from where Briggs himself was. Later, about eight o'clock, when Briggs was handing up blades [26] to one of his men, Thomas Harris's figure approached along the garden fence to within fifteen feet of where Briggs was working. He vanished ("always to the east") without the helper seeing him. The third appearance took place in the same spot about nine-thirty when the ghost came up to the fence and remained leaning on it within ten feet of Briggs.

Briggs pointed in that direction and asked his young assistant if he did not see Thomas Harris; the young man answered in the negative.[27] Then Briggs approached the apparition, climbed over the fence where it was standing, and the two walked off together—going about five hundred yards and conversing the whole way. At last it became clear to Briggs what Harris's ghost wanted of him. Thomas Harris was disturbed over the developments in the administration of his former estate. It was his ghostly wish that his brother James keep the estate intact until the children became of age at which time it should be divided among them.[28]

Thomas Harris's ghost then told Briggs the details of a secret conversation which had taken place between himself and his brother, James—a "conversation which passed between them on the east side of the wheat

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8. After he arrived home he mentioned to his young companion what had happened. And, even before this episode, he had told James Harris that he had seen the ghost of his brother.

[26] Down unto fairly recent times it was the practice in this area to strip off the lower leaves or blades of corn and tie them in small bundles which were then stacked away for later use as feed for the animals on the farm.

[27] *Appearance of a Ghost*, p. 8. The young assistant, a John Bailey, supported Briggs's testimony at this point when he took the stand but said again that he saw nothing himself (p. 10).

[28] Those who have studied the recorded "appearances" of ghosts have noted that the motive which seems to lie behind a large number of these occurrences is the "urge to set right an injustice done in the settlement of an estate." In this case, however, Thomas Harris's ghost wished to prevent the injustice from happening. William Oliver Stevens, *Psychics and Common Sense: An Introduction to the Study of Psychic Phenomena* (New York, 1953), devotes a chapter to such cases.

stacks, the day he was taken with his death sickness." [29] Then, after ordering Briggs to turn around, it disappeared. Briggs later related that the voice with which the ghost spoke was not the voice of the living man and that it was very low, so low in fact that often it could not be understood.

Briggs then went to James Harris and told him he had seen his brother's ghost three times that morning. When Briggs asked James if he remembered the reported conversation at the wheat stacks, James said that he did, and he told Briggs what had taken place. Brigg's knowledge of the event convinced Harris that Briggs had really seen the ghost of his brother, for he was certain that no one else knew of that conversation. James agreed to follow the new plan for disposing of the property,[30] and Briggs reported this agreement to the ghost later that morning.

There were later conversations with the apparition, according to Briggs, but never again did the subject of the estate come up. What they talked of no one learned. Naturally enough those in court wanted to hear all the conversations with the ghost:

> The counsel were extremely anxious to hear from Mr. Briggs the whole of the conversation of the Ghost, and on his cross examination, took every means, without effect, to obtain it: they represented to him, that as a religious man, he was bound to disclose the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; he appeared extremely agitated when applied to, declared nothing short of loss of life should make him reveal the whole conversation, and claimed the protection of the court, that he had disclosed all he knew relative to the case.[31]

The court overruled the question of the counsel.

Just as the courtroom was left with its curiosity unabated, so are we. The author of our sole source of knowledge about this trial, having had only one interest—proving the existence of this Eastern Shore ghost—failed to record the decision of the court with regard to the contested property. This is indeed unfortunate for, combined with the fact that there is a gap in the Queen Anne's County records at this very time, his negligence leaves us ignorant of the outcome. Was ghostly justice triumphant? That is the question we are left with.

[29] *Appearance of a Ghost*, pp. 8-9.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS

Shout Treason: The Trial of Aaron Burr. By FRANCIS F. BEIRNE. New York: Hastings House, 1959. 308. $5.

In the spring of 1805 a traveler set out on horseback from Washington. His immediate destination was Pittsburgh. His journey would carry him further in both miles and fortune. The traveler was Colonel Aaron Burr, until a few weeks before, the third Vice-President of the United States.

Burr had been a colorful figure in the fight for American Independence and in the civil life of the infant nation. If attributed to a character of fiction, his personality would seem overdrawn. Of arresting appearance, high intellect, liberal education, aristocratic background and almost hypnotic charm in conversation, he was one of the more striking figures who has appeared on the stage of public life in America.

Two years later he was a prisoner in Richmond, Virginia, charged with treason. In those two short years his activities insured that on the pages of history his name would appear in type bolder than that usually accorded a Vice-President and he would become better known than many of his contemporaries whose achievements were more deserving of credit.

While it was not known publicly, when Burr left Washington he was insolvent, financially and politically. Never high in favor with Washington and suspect in the eyes of Jefferson, his brilliant performance while presiding at the impeachment of Justice Chase closed his official political career. Because of his duel with Hamilton he was under indictment in New York and New Jersey. His income was insufficient to maintain the living standards he had established. Balanced against this side of the ledger was complete self confidence and a personal ambition comparable only with his devotion to his one child, a daughter of great personal charm who fully returned her father's affection.

While Colonel Burr was the central figure in what was, perhaps, the most sensational criminal trial in the annals of the United States, persons and influences of greater importance were involved. To this reader the volume is secondarily the history of that trial. In a less disturbed period with more deliberate action by the Government before instituting proceedings the result may well have been either no trial or a successful prosecution. Burr's activities were seized upon as an issue to be capitalized by powerful political forces.

The struggle between the Federalists advocating an all powerful central government and the newly organized party seeking containment of those powers was in the early stages of the conflict which has continued until today. Among the arch proponents of the forces of centralization was John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States, who presided at the

trial. The chief architect of the opposing party was Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States. These were the real contestants in the Burr case and they were engaged in a deadly serious political maneuver.

Before Burr was apprehended Jefferson issued a Proclamation asserting that there could be no doubt that Burr was guilty. In that day, as in this, that was an extraordinary pronouncement. While Burr was awaiting trial Marshall attended a dinner given in honor of the accused. In that day, as in this, that was an extraordinary act.

Against a background of the drab surroundings of the old Hall of the House of Delegates in Richmond, devoid of the trappings of pageantry which marked the trials of Warren Hastings and Samuel Chase, the author conjures up an interesting group of " Shadow-shapes," including bearers of distinguished names: Jefferson, Marshall, Andrew Jackson, John Randolph of Roanoke (whose selection as foreman of the Grand Jury was enough to cause eyebrows to be raised), Wickham, Hay, McRae, Martin (of Maryland), Wirt, the young Botts whose career was improvidently cut short in the theatre fire, the celebrated editor Ritchie, the Randolphs, Peyton and Edmund, David Robertson who preserved the incidents of trial, the aspiring young artist, St. Memin, the fledging writer, Washington Irving, the notable " Two Parsons " Buchanan and Blair and the youthful Winfield Scott. We are told of the allowance by Congress of the disputed and questionable claims of General Eaton on the eve of his testimony against Burr. General Wilkinson, the posturing professional patriot of the plot, the strange Blennerhassetts and many others are included. In attendance was a cross section of the citizenry of the Commonwealth, the fine raiment of the easterner mingling with the leathern hunting garments of the frontiersman. There also was Colonel Edward Carrington, closely related by marriage to the presiding judge, who named him foreman of the jury. Again we have cause for comment in that day as in this. Parenthetically, we find the wife of the foreman sending delicacies to Blennerhassett (anonymously for the nonce it is true) while he was awaiting trial.

If Marshall conferred with Cyrus Griffin, the resident judge who sat with him, there is no indication of it in his opinions. Griffin had ability. In age he was seven years senior. With a career of distinction behind him, for the past eighteen years he had presided over the federal courts in Virginia with additional credit to his fame. Marshall's only judicial experience was six years as Chief Justice. It is probable that Griffin was one of the few objective observers of the trial and it is regrettable that he left no record of his impressions. If he concurred in the opinions it is singular that Marshall made no allusion to support from such a source as this veteran judge appointed by Washington.

Both Jefferson and Marshall were careful to avoid a test of powers between the heads of the Governmental branches they represented. Both compromised when it appeared that Burr's application for a subpoena to require the presence of Jefferson might provide such an issue. Marshall's tactics in Marbury v. Madison was recent history.

The result of the trial was " inconclusive " but the verdict, as shown

by the record, was phrased as a result of considered deliberation by the jury. In retrospect this *cause celebrèbre* was a mere skirmish between advocates of opposing political theories. It did illustrate the high state of excitement to which the public can be aroused by sensational charges. It shows the lengths to which men in places of high responsibility will sometimes go when objectivity is lost in waging a crusade.

The volume is well worth study by the student of American history to whom it will provide interesting reading. The well told story with descriptions and recitals of the conduct of the characters is highly entertaining with a touch of romance which will appeal to the casual reader. By those who prefer direct references to source material the lack of foot-notes may be regretted. However, the bibliography reflects a wide range of research and sources available to the scholar who may desire to pursue his studies further.

The author, a distinguished editor and columnist, is a Virginian by birth and education and was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University. He is the author of several other books of note. In this one he entertainingly reveals an intimate knowledge of the traditions and locations of Richmond relating to this occurrence of more than a hundred and fifty years ago as well as a careful study of the facts with which he deals.

STERLING HUTCHESON

Boydton, Virginia

Mexico, 1825-1828. The Journal and Correspondence of Edward Thornton Tayloe. Edited by C. HARVEY GARDINER. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959. 212. $5.

The author of the journal and letters, here edited as a unit, was the son of a well-to-do Virginia planter. Educated at Harvard and seeking congenial employment in which he could render a public service, he spent three years in Mexico as the unpaid private secretary of United States Minister Joel R. Poinsett. He approached his post with zest and enthusiasm, albeit with certain prejudices. Among these was his repeatedly expressed and bitter antipathy toward Roman Catholicism.

Young Tayloe thus witnessed at first hand the establishment of United States relations with Mexico by a minister who tried at times to influence Mexican politics (Witness Poinsett's well-known work with the *Yorkino* (York Rite) Masonic Lodge).. Unfortunately for the present day historian the writer was exceedingly discreet. When one of his early letters to a brother found its way into print, he sharply enjoined the brother to hold all future reports on public affairs in strictest confidence. Occasional comments on British activities were shrewd, statements concerning Spanish colonialism were sharply critical, and references to Mexican leaders and conditions were incisive. Probably the most valuable feature of the volume, however, is the indirect light shed on early United States diplo-

matic activities. These were geared to an odd mixture of personal relations and personal politics all slowed to the tempo of sailing ships by water and of horse travel by land—and the whole conducted by gentlemen genuinely inspired by democratic principles who nevertheless kept a keen eye trained on home politics.

Descriptions of scenery and travel conditions form the major portions of the account. Little space is devoted to social affairs and customs. Most of the trips reported, aggregating some 2,000 miles, were accomplished on horseback and over trails that were both rough and hazardous. The young writer showed passing interest in archaeological remains but his chief attention was devoted to mines and geography. Indeed, he urged his family to invest in one or two promising ventures. Caustic comments on travel accommodations were tempered by repeated acknowledgment of the friendliness of the Mexican people. Incidentally, he reports on one trip in company with John Slidell, later prominent in the diplomatic relations of the two countries, at a date earlier than any such trip noted by Slidell's biographer.

The editor's knowledge of the general field and his scholarship are skillfully shown, his cross references to other authorities are excellent, and only a few minor errors escaped his notice. For instance, the latitude cited on page 166 does not coincide with that shown on the end papers; also some of Tayloe's references to directions and points of the compass are slightly inaccurate. Incidentally, the end papers appear at first glance to represent all Mexico instead of only a limited portion of it. An inset showing the section covered would have helped to orient the reader. More important, though the title of the volume restricts the story to Mexico, the Epilogue is puzzling. If given at all why is it so strangely condensed? The expulsion of General William Henry Harrison from Colombia was a most colorful affair. Other documents and reports concerning it would have been most welcome. The reader wonders why, if the episode is mentioned at all, he is given such a scant glimpse of this tantalizing story when the total length of the volume here published is less than 225 pages.

This call for "more of the same" indicates that the reviewer considers this little publication has real value. It gives the reader that unconscious realism which research workers so ardently seek and so seldom find in the cold documents of the period.

W. H. Callcott

University of South Carolina

The Development of Banking in the District of Columbia. By David M. Cole. New York: The William-Frederick Press, 1959. x, 629 pp. $10.

In this careful history of banking in the District of Columbia from its beginnings in the 1790's until the 1950's, Dr. David M. Cole places main emphasis upon the unique nature of the economy in which it

developed. In that economy commerce, manufacturing, and finance have never amounted to much, especially in comparison with their proportions in other major cities. Foreign trade was fairly important until the port and city of Alexandria, originally part of the District, reverted in 1846 to the control of Virginia. Such light manufactures as the making of beer, bread, and bricks developed, but their products were aimed at the local market. Washington seems never to have been a center of finance. The relative lack of these more normal investment and loan outlets has always exerted an important influence upon the character of banking in the District, especially before the Civil War. Since then, the more significant element of uniqueness in the District's economy has been the presence of the national government.

Nothing, it may be observed, reflects so well the title of the pre-Civil War balance of political power towards the states rather than the national government as does the relative sparseness of the Capital's population, and the dismal, undeveloped appearance of the Capital City itself. Even in 1865 the City's parks were unimproved and neglected, its streets mainly unpaved, its lighting system antiquated, its sewage system non-existent. Population did not begin to grow rapidly till after the War. Then it expanded during two World Wars and during the deep depression of the 1930's mainly in consonance with the expansion in activities of the national government. To the consumer needs of this population, both resident and visiting, banking services of the District are today largely oriented. Freed by the minor importance of industry and trade from the fluctuations experienced by many other areas; securely dependent upon the solvency and regularity of Uncle Sam as the great source of income payments, bankers of the District since the Civil War have tended towards gilt-edged conservatism in their investment policies.

Interesting to the economic historian as these post-Civil War developments must be, the author makes his major contribution in his description of the earlier period. But his contributions, it must be acknowledged, are mainly in the form of important evidence which the author has failed to relate to problems of major interest to historians. He presents, for example evidence that the District's banks helped finance internal improvements not only by stock purchases and loans to canal and turnpike companies but also by lending money to the City of Washington to permit the latter to pay for its own stock subscriptions. This adds interestingly to information previously supplied us by Prof. Carter Goodrich, but the author does not make the point. His interest, that is to say, is not in the part played by commercial banks in the formation of the capital required by an underdeveloped nation, but rather in their neglect of the "best principles of banking" in making long-term loans and investments.

Examples might be multiplied. Suffice it to observe that Cole's book has a good deal of evidence in support of Esther Taus' contention that the Treasury Department performed important "central banking" functions; that his pages have rich materials for the study of the development of business organization (for example, unchartered joint stock companies with *limited* liability); that he is especially suggestive in his treatment of

note brokers and "Exchange Banking houses" as engaged in types of activities out of which investment banking was to develop, and so on. He never cites Taus, nor for that matter Redlich, W. B. Smith, Hammond, Wettereau, or other modern students of early American banking. His book is nevertheless far more than a comprehensive memoir that all bankers will want to possess. Based upon meticulous research in contemporary printed materials, and to a lesser extent in manuscript sources, and written with clarity and scrupulous care, Cole's book is an empirical study of more than ordinary importance for economic historians.

STUART BRUCHEY

Michigan State University

Crane Hook on the Delaware 1667-1699, an Early Swedish Lutheran Church and Community with the Historical Background of the Delaware River Valley. By JEANNETTE ECKMAN. [Published for the Delaware Swedish Colonial Society by the Institute of Delaware History and Culture.] Newark, Del.; University of Delaware Press, 1958. xv, 143 pp. maps and other illustrations. $3.50 softbound, $5.00 hardbound.

Jeannette Eckman, acknowledged dean of Delaware historians, formerly Director of the Delaware Federal Writers Project and one of the three editors of the excellent *Delaware, A Guide to the First State*, author of the recent revised edition of this work, and contributer of articles on Delaware history to various publications including the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, has in this little book brilliantly recreated and recorded a period of Delaware colonial history otherwise lost to scholar or layman. The importance of her work lies in its originality. Crane Hook, once some thousand acres of rural culture, is today merged and lost in the industrialized area of South Wilmington and the approach to the Delaware Memorial Bridge. The place name itself almost forgotten, only a marker on private commercial property commemorates the church of the Crane Hook congregation; and as Miss Eckman discovered in exploration, even this one remaining fact is inaccurate, for the actual site of the church was a half-mile distant. Working from old land records, journals, letters, and similar sources, Miss Eckman was able to establish for the first time the sequence of settlement in the area, adding greatly to our knowledge of the history of New Sweden.

The first three chapters of this book deal with the background of the Crane Hook settlement and are equally valuable to the reader, for they give perhaps the briefest, best, and most up-to-date description to be had of the colonization of New Sweden. This colonial venture is clearly shown as an offshoot of Dutch expansion in the New World,—Henry Hudson was the first explorer in Delaware Bay, and the Dutch established short-

lived colonies in the Valley about 1624 and in 1631. The Dutch governor in New Amsterdam, Peter Minuit, could not forget the area and it was he who presented to the Swedish King the proposals resulting in the arrival of the ships "Kalmar Nyckel" and "Vogel Grip" to establish Fort Christina in 1638. The Dutch, who had virtually created the Swedish offspring, cast longing eyes upon the tiny colony as it developed in the next decade, and shortly thereafter Peter Stuyvesant built the rival Fort Casimir (Newcastle) six miles down the river, and finally took over the entire settlement in 1655.

It was after this time that the area on the western side of the Delaware River, below Fort Christina, known as Crane Hook, was settled—possibly first by Dutch inhabitants about 1658—probably by Swedes and Finns about 1660. In 1667, three years after the taking over of all New Netherlands by the English, Crane Hook Church was built. It marked an important step in the continuity of Swedish life in the Delaware Valley, for although an independent colony for a very brief time, the cultural influence of New Sweden was maintained in the area through the Swedish Lutheran Church. Crane Hook Church no longer exists but its site and probable description were recovered by Miss Eckman. It was a small log structure with overhanging gable roof, and thus symbolizes one of the most enduring Swedish contributions to American life—the "log cabin." (Indeed, the idea of the natively "American" log cabin with all its associations of frontier life has been so entrenched in popular and scholarly imagination that only in recent years was its real origin revealed.)

Crane Hook Church prospered until the end of the seventeenth century when the congregation decided to rebuild in a more convenient location near the site of the old fort. The stone building, completed in 1699 and named Holy Trinity, is the present "Old Swedes" Church of Wilmington, the major link in the chain of Swedish influence in the Delaware Valley. The information on the Crane Hook Congregation, so readably expounded by Miss Eckman, is not in any of the major sources on Delaware history. It is not included in J. Thomas Scharf's *History of Delaware, 1609-1888,* nor is it to be found in the comprehensive two volumes of Amandus Johnson, *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware 1638-1664*. Miss Eckman's study of Crane Hook must thus be placed immediately after Johnson's work on any definitive bibliography of the history of the Delaware Valley. The author, the Institute of Delaware History and Culture, and the Swedish Colonial Society—whose first publication this is—must all share the honors for this well-written, well-illustrated and well presented little volume. It fulfills the Society's hope expressed in the Foreword, that although Crane Hook has disappeared, "knowing the human history made here by these early settlers enriches our thinking of the local past."

LORRAINE WAXMAN PEARCE

Washington, D. C.

Republicans Face the Southern Question: The New Departure Years, 1877-1897. By VINCENT P. DESANTIS. (*The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science,* Series LXXVII, Number 1.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959. viii, 276. $5.

One of the great exercises in futility of American political history was the continuing effort of Republicans after Reconstruction to win back the Southern states. Professor De Santis with eminent success demonstrates in this volume that the Republican Party did not abandon the South in the years after Reconstruction, although it did abandon the Negroes, but rather went through a tortuous twisting and turning of policy, vainly seeking issues and groups on which to base a more solid party in the South.

Rutherford B. Hayes, after ending federal military intervention in the South, proceeded to woo the conservative whites with a program of old-fashioned Whiggery. This failed, and after the brief Garfield administration Chester A. Arthur developed a policy of cooperation with the budding independent movements of the South, only to find a Democrat succeeding him as President. Under Harrison, there was a brief flurry of Stalwartism, with the Lodge Bill for federal supervision of congressional elections, but that aroused no widespread popular support and was pushed aside to break the parliamentary log-jam of silver and tariff legislation. Finally, in the nineties there developed a confusing pattern of Republican fusion with populistic movements, a program that provided only one short-lived success in North Carolina.

In the end, the overall result was a progressive deterioration of the Republican position, with slight gains in the white counties but a precipitous decline in the black belts. A return to the Radical equalitarian program would have been incongruous for the party of big business and would have evoked hostility even in the North. The other elements, independent, greenbacker, and populistic, were even stranger bedfellows for the Republicans than the Negroes. The strongest group of potential Republicans, the conservative whites, were too deeply entrenched in the Democratic party. Add to that Republican factionalism, the fear of another Reconstruction in the South, and the inability of the national leadership to arrive at a consistent policy, and Republican frustration becomes in retrospect about as inevitable and predetermined as anything can be in history.

However, the fact that this is the history of an inevitable failure does not detract from the importance of the subject, and Professor De Santis has illuminated significantly Southern political history in the period. His research has been comprehensive and the book is solidly based on the manuscript and newspaper sources, including an investigation of Negro attitudes and reactions. This reviewer can cavil at only three points: an overall analysis of the reasons for Republican failure at the end of the book would have been helpful; the book is somewhat marred by minor

typographical errors, and it is regrettable that a press whose name is synonymous with scholarship could publish such an important contribution without a bibliography.

GEORGE B. TINDALL

University of North Carolina

A Life for the Confederacy. By ROBERT A. MOORE. Edited by JAMES W. SILVER. Jackson, Tenn.: McCowat-Mercer Press, 1959. 182, Illus. $4.

Cleburne and His Command. By IRVING A. BUCK. Edited by THOMAS R. HAY. Jackson, Tenn.: McCowat-Mercer Press, 1959. 378, Illus. $6.

Gardner's Photographic Sketch Book of the Civil War. By ALEXANDER GARDNER. Edited by E. F. BLEILER. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. 224, Illus. $6.

A general is only as good as the men who serve under him. Much of Caesar's greatness emanated from the valor of the Tenth Legion, and the same may be said of Charlemagne and his Paladins, of Cromwell and his Ironsides, and of Napoleon and the Old Guard. That the Southern Confederacy, doomed to failure from overwhelming odds from without and from shaky construction from within, could nevertheless produce such a group of daring generals as Lee, Jackson, Forrest, Cleburne and Stuart was due in large part to the powder-begrimed, ill-equipped and tattered warriors who became soldiers by necessity and killers by experience.

Soldiers on both sides of the conflict for American unity suffered privations and endured hardships that would make modern militarists cringe in horror. At the same time, they possessed a uniqueness of character and an indomitable will as typically American as sow belly and mountain dew. Such a soldier was Private Robert A. Moore, 17th Mississippi Infantry Regiment. He typified the common soldier of the Civil War—he liked a good shot of whiskey, was undoubtedly proficient in the use of profanity, had an eagle eye for a pretty ankle, and became extremely devout on the eve of every battle. He freely admitted his shortcomings as a soldier, once noting in his diary after coming off sentry duty that he "came near shooting a loose horse tonight because he would not stop and give the countersign." Yet Moore soon acquired the rudiments of war and demonstrated his mettle at Fredericksburg and Gettysburg. His death at Chickamauga in September, 1863, was as abrupt and as unnecessary as the war which caused it.

The value of his war diary lies not in battle descriptions. Moore was a modest person when describing his own part in action and generally summarized his role with such terse statements as: "I was in among the cannon balls at Mitchells Ford." Yet he compensated for a lack of battle

narratives with straightforward, often humorous, pictures of camp life and his fellow soldiers. When a windstorm blew down all the regimental tents, baring the occupants to the ravages of the elements, Moore wrote drily, "The Col. is sitting on the floor of his tent looking like an old dove whose nest has been robbed." And after receiving a whiskey ration at the end of a hard, cold day, he philosophized: "I think the drams are a little too small for the weather."

Moore's intriguing and fast-moving journal is an untampered, realistic picture of war from within the ranks. It reflects the bitterness, loneliness and sacrifice of Confederate soldiers that is so often shaded into oblivion by the overcrowded school of Civil War romanticists. The book presents a keen insight into soldier life, and it is one of the best collections of primary material to be uncovered in recent years.

In the higher echelon of Confederate soldiers, Major General Patrick R. Cleburne held an exalted position. He was the highest ranking Irishman in the Southern armies, and he proved himself to be as courageous in battle as he was full of ideas. He almost lost his job early in the war when he recommended that slaves be made eligible for Confederate service through emancipation. Richmond vetoed the plan sharply, and though Cleburne soon received for bravery the sobriquet, "Stonewall Jackson of the West," he never again received further promotion. Wounded three times in the war (once being shot in the mouth), he always returned to lead his division into battle. When he fell dead before the Federal trenches at Franklin in November, 1864, men by the hundreds wept openly in the field.

Cleburne and His Command, first published in 1908, was written by the General's assistant adjutant-general, who combined personal reminiscences and official reports into a work that has long commanded a premium price on the secondhand book market. Irving Buck succeeded in blending together the thoroughness of a staff officer and the affection for Cleburne felt by all who knew him. Moreover, from his vantage point as a staff officer, Buck saw the actions of the Rebel brass and knew the feelings of the men in the ranks. The result is no mere biography; rather, it is a panorama of the battles and leaders of the Army of Tennessee. Cleburne is the main actor on the stages of Shiloh, Chickamauga, Chattanooga and Atlanta, and his supporting cast include Polk, Hardee, Bragg, Cheatham and a host of others.

This new edition of a classic military study has been annotated by Thomas R. Hay, a painstaking scholar and a leading authority on the war in the West. The value of modern scholarship has been added to a work already rich in content. This is the definitive study of Cleburne, a man so gallant in battle and so dauntless in the face of death that General Polk was moved to state: "When his division defended, no odds broke its lines; where it attacked, no numbers resisted its onslaught, save only once, and there is the grave of Cleburne."

With the easy availability of such huge collections of wartime photographs as *Divided We Fought, The Photographic History of the Civil War* and *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, the reprinting of the relatively

smaller *Gardner's Photographic Sketch Book of the Civil War* seems somewhat superfluous. True, the work is the " only contemporary photographic book (1866) " of that struggle and, as such, will have value for collectors, but it contains little more than a potpourri of one hundred pictures—many of them already familiar—taken in towns and camps and on battlefields and rivers.

Alexander Gardner was chief assistant to the famous Civil War photographer Matthew Brady until 1863, when he formed his own independent field studio. His methods and subsequent photographs did not vary from those of his teacher, and his comprehension of things important appears to have suffered from the termination of services with Brady. That Gardner took many of the early wartime photographs later attributed to Brady is no sin on Brady's part, as the editor of this slim volume might have the reader believe. A basic tenet of American capitalism has always been that the employer reaps the larger share of the harvests of his employees.

The photographs in this work are interesting, not absorbing, and one might easily attach more importance to the accompanying sketches than to the pictures themselves. As the introduction to this new edition of Gardner's collection inadvertently pointed out, Brady remains the great name in Civil War photography, just as his own collection, *The Photographic History of the Civil War*, is the chief depository for a visual knowledge of the 1861-1865 conflict.

JAMES I. ROBERTSON, JR.

State University of Iowa

The Old South Illustrated. By PORTE CRAYON. Edited by CECIL D. EBY, JR. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959. xxi, 295. $6.

This book is an anthology culled from a series of papers that first appeared in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* between 1853 and 1860, the earliest of which, *Virginia Illustrated*, was published also in book form in 1857 and reprinted in 1871. " Porte Crayon " was the pen name of David Hunter Strother (1816-1888) of Martinsburg in what is now West Virginia—or Virginia irredenta, as its natives would maintain. Strother was a member of a prominent family, related through his mother to the brothers Philip Pendleton and John Esten Cooke and to John Pendleton Kennedy. Having failed, because of his father's political affiliations, to get an appointment to West Point, he studied art in New York under Samuel F. B. Morse. In 1840 he set out for a three-year trip to France and Italy, a member of that vast horde of American art-students so vividly described by Van Wyck Brooks in *The Dream of Arcadia* who poured into Europe to escape the cultural isolationism and stagnation that had for

so long afflicted the United States. During the Civil War, in spite of his Southern background, he joined the Union army, in which he rose to the rank of colonel; and later he turned his war experiences to good use in a series of articles that was also published by *Harper's*. But his adherence to the Union cost him many of his life-long friends.

Strother was a member of that now almost extinct type: the author-illustrator, like the much greater George Du Maurier in England a generation later. The editor points out that, in the 1850's, illustrations were an absolute necessity for a successful magazine; hence, a man who could both write acceptably and provide drawings suitable for wood-engraving could command the then astronomical sum of four or five hundred dollars for an article. And since *Harper's* had the largest circulation of any American magazine of the period, Strother became a very well-known figure. The editor even claims that, during the 'fifties, "ten read his work for every one who had even heard of Hawthorne, Melville, or Whitman," and this claim is probably correct. Now the night of oblivion has closed firmly over him.

These selections from Strother's work include, first, an account of a fishing trip to the Falls of the Blackwater River, near what is now Davis, West Virginia. Then there is a description of a journey by carriage that began at Staunton and took in parts of the Shenandoah Valley, Natural Bridge, some of the Virginia Springs and then returned, by way of Lynchburg, to Charlottesville. There is also a description of the Dismal Swamp, and finally, from *North Carolina Illustrated* and *A Winter in the South*, sketches of parts of North Carolina and of Tennessee. The modern reader who is familiar with these localities as they are today will naturally derive the greatest pleasure from the book.

Whatever may have been the popularity of Strother in his own day, his importance now is largely archaeological. To a modern reader, his descriptions seem over-written and his humor out-dated. Nothing goes out of style so quickly as does humor; the comic touch of the 'fifties seems extremely heavy-handed today. So the most interesting aspect of the book and the one that justifies its revival is its picture of a long-vanished America. Strother had the advantage of writing just before the war that split our history into two parts; without knowing it, he caught in his drawings and his descriptions an America that was very soon to disappear forever. It is a trite remark but nevertheless a true one that the American scene as depicted in any book of this period seems infinitely remote; we are startled when we stop to calculate that Strother was writing only a trifle more than a century ago, so great has been the change. When he and his friends ventured into the mountains of West Virginia, they were entering a real wilderness; the inns at which he stopped in the Valley of Virginia seem Elizabethan in their primitive accommodations and their incredible quantities of food. It was a crude age—only ten years earlier Dickens had drawn his blistering picture of American gaucherie—yet the modern American who finds it increasingly difficult to get a decent meal in any public establishment will enjoy reading of a day when a

traveller driving out of Staunton could shoot "pheasant" from his carriage, when most inns served venison at every supper, and when the best apple brandy in Tennessee cost twelve and a half cents a quart.

TENCH FRANCIS TILGHMAN
The Virginia Polytechnic Institute

The Royal Governors of Georgia, 1754-1775. By W. W. ABBOT. (Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture, at Williamsburg.) Chapel Hill; The University of North Carolina Press, 1959. vii, 198. $5.

The main purpose of this book is to present the personalities and the policies of the three royal governors of Georgia: John Reynolds (1754-1757), Henry Ellis (1757-1760), and Sir James Wright (1760-1775). Reynolds, a career-seeking naval officer, "left the colony in worse condition than he had found it." Ellis, "an odd and rather wonderful Englishman," put "the prosperity of the inhabitants first." Wright, a "professional," served the King faithfully until the end.

There is implied in these three accounts an explanation of the coming of the revolution in Georgia. This is a more important subject than the lives of the governors and makes the book of general interest to all concerned with the revolution in America. Abbot gives a picture of a class society: placemen loyal to England, merchants and planters somewhat divided in allegiance, and the lesser folk of the town and back country. The contest in Georgia boiled down to a struggle between Wright and the Liberty Boys.

The Liberty Boys were merchants and planters who engineered a break with England by driving the reluctant members of their own class along. There were no economic grievances in Georgia, for the colony was in the midst of an explosion of prosperity. If there were no economic grievances and since both Ellis and Wright were as able and sympathetic governors as could be found in America, why did the Liberty Boys seek a revolution? Abbot blames "forces from the outside," specifically the drag of South Carolina radicals. "Had the Savannah River been fifty miles wide instead of only a few yards, the people of Georgia would hardly have even considered breaking with Britain in 1776."

Lieutenant Governor Bull of South Carolina thought South Carolina influenced by news from the north; Wright thought Georgia influenced by news from South Carolina. Both were no doubt right. There was a chain reaction running the length of the colonies, which helped the colonies vibrate as one. Yet there was a situation in each colony which made the appeal to revolution from the north quite strong. Abbot with great insight opens up the Georgia situation. On pages 128-129 Abbot suggests that Georgia in the 1760's might be compared with Virginia after 1688. Georgia had then reached a stage of "wealth, self-assurance and

political maturity" where she demanded as of right self-government. Perhaps the Georgians were merely trying to do what Englishmen had done in 1688. Abbot mentions that "the majority of the Assembly was quite ready to grasp at the powers of the Governor or Council, but . . . they were leery of giving offense to King or Parliament." The merchants and planters certainly wanted to be respected and to be given a share of the rule, to control the Council, to appoint the judges, etc.—to rule out arbitrariness in government. Abbot might add to his theme by looking at the royal placemen in Georgia which he did under Reynolds but failed to do under the other two governors. Were the placemen entrenched in the Council as they were in South Carolina? The Georgia and South Carolina merchants and planters might have been in a similar position. Then Abbot would not need to overemphasize the amount of unanimity in South Carolina.

Abbot has done a superb job on the governors, their successes and failures. The next task is to give faces and names to the Liberty Boys. As there were only fifty to one hundred families who were of importance, this job could be done with a vigorous and intensive search of all of the records.

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR.

University of South Carolina

The Maryland and Delaware Genealogist. Edited by RAYMOND B. CLARK, JR. Vol. I, No. 1. (Sept. 1959) 24 pp. $5 per year; single issue $1.50.

Maryland and Delaware genealogists and historians will now be happy to find that a periodical concerned with genealogical source material is again available to them. *The Maryland and Delaware Genealogist,* published in Washington, D. C., made its first appearance in September of this year with an auspicious beginning in the publication of certain hard to find source materials. Among these must be mentioned early Calvert County wills, which will be of much interest to those whose investigations are constantly frustrated by the destruction of records in that early county. Attractively multilithed and neatly arranged, the first issue of *The Genealogist* is a welcome arrival among the periodical bibliography of the two-state area involved.

JOHN D. KILBOURNE

Maryland Historical Society

The Origin and Meaning of the Name "Protestant Episcopal." By ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER. New York: American Church Publications, 1959. xx, 339. $3.95.

Throughout the Middle Ages the Church in Europe maintained a degree of unity under the leadership of the Bishop of Rome, but oftimes strong kings and emperors permitted little more than nominal authority over their subjects on the part of the bishop who claimed to be the successor of St. Peter. The terms *Ecclesia Anglicana, Ecclesia Gallicanum, Ecclesia Scoticanum* and a host of others were often used to designate the Church in the several national jurisdictions. It was only natural, then, that the Church of the English should simply translate this title to designate themselves when the breach with Rome occurred in the Sixteenth Century.

And as long as the American colonies remained part and parcel of the English kingdom, the term Church of England was sufficient to designate those priests and congregations which remained in communion with the see of Canterbury. When the American congregations were forced to reorganize at the close of the American Revolution, the term *Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* was chosen as the official designation for those who continued to be in communion with the English Church.

From the beginning there were those who expressed the opinion that the title did not represent the true picture of the Episcopal Church, and since the Oxford Movement in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, there have been numerous attempts to change the name of the Church. For example, the Confederate Church seriously considered the title "The Reformed Catholic Church." Most informed Protestants readily concede that Episcopalians are not protestant in the same sense as those who call themselves Evangelical Churches. The discussion over the years has usually developed more heat than light. Dr. Shoemaker in a scholarly treatise has traced the origin and the meaning of the title from its earliest use. He has shown the way in which the words have been used over the ages, how they have come to connote a variety of meanings, and why Protestant Episcopalians do not view themselves as Non-catholics.

While a rose may smell as sweet under another name, the word "dandelion" does not bring to mind an image of a rose. So, too, with the names applied to churches. "Protestant Episcopal" connotes "non-catholic" to many people; "Catholic" connotes only "papist" to others. Dr. Shoemaker considers carefully the semantics involved in these and a host of other ecclesiastical titles and pleads for more careful use of terms. The book is not merely an exercise in semantics, however, for he traces the whole problem throughout three centuries of endeavor.

The study is a valuable one if one would understand the Anglican position, if he would converse intelligently about the several churches, if he would understand the issues involved in the whole problem of Christian Reunion.

NELSON RIGHTMYER

Glyndon, Md.

America Is Born. By GERALD W. JOHNSON. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1959. 254, $3.95.

Prompted by the desire to present the story of the founding of this nation in terms which are meaningful to Peter, his grandson, Gerald Johnson has achieved remarkably what many before him have attempted with far less success. Drawing upon his extraordinary fund of knowledge of American history, he has been able to describe and explain with vividness and simplicity familiar theories and ideas which have long defied the ability of textbook writers to present in understandable terms for younger students. Mr. Johnson has had rare success in writing an account which is readily understood by youth and exceedingly interesting reading for both young and old. The phraseology is colorful and humorous in good taste and with good effect, in making clear the interpretation which is sought.

Probably the most significant feature of the work is the fine sense of history which Mr. Johnson brings to his task. He has splendid historical judgment which he imparts in good style and without the usual oversimplification of ideas. Herein lies the unique character of the book.

The account is sharpened here and there with unfamiliar details and incidents not usually found in popular treatises. Familiar pre-Revolutionary happenings are told in a way that makes them seem new and revealing, since Mr. Johnson has departed from the usual presentation of facts by introducing fresh particulars which are recounted with new insight and meaning. But most important of all, Mr. Johnson has succeeded in presenting in simple language the European background and the founding of the Nation and the source of some of the qualities inherent in the character of the American people. This is done deftly as to language and vividly as to thought, so that the author expresses in a brief book with new slants on familiar materials a profoundly important theme.

The illustrations by Leonard Everett Fisher are bold in design and striking in effect. They are effectively arranged as separate pages or inserted on partial pages with the text. The whole book is a great success, and one would hope that Mr. Johnson might be encouraged to go on with the American story and to deal with such ideas as sectional rivalry with the skill which he has brought to the period of exploration and colonization.

HENRY H. CALLARD

Baltimore, Md.

Everyday Life in Colonial Maryland. By GEORGE SCHAUN and VIRGINIA C. SHAUN. Annapolis: Greenbury Publications, 1959. 75.

It is always a pleasure to welcome a book on social and economic history. This present volume is an informally written story obviously for the younger student. As such, the scholar may not completely approve of its publication. It does, however, arouse one's interest in exploring further these well-travelled ways of the colonial period in American history.

The authors have discussed colonial life in sixteen chapters. They do not consider the religious, military, or political events of the period. They have, rather, included chapters on clothing, food and drink, a day in the life of a hypothetical Jimmy Randall, and heating and lighting to mention but a few. There are three appendices which tell the reader what was happening elsewhere while all this was going on, and a list of things which did and did not exist.

The book is printed by the offset process and is bound in spiral-type binding. It obviously is not a history of Maryland for school use. It should be used with reservations by the serious student. It is, however, encouraging to witness two amateurs exploit this sort of topic and to place a work of this nature in print.

FRANK F. WHITE, JR.

Maryland Hall of Records

The Prehistoric People of Accokeek Creek. By ROBERT L. STEPHENSON. Washington: The Accokeek Foundation, 1959. 35. $1.

This slender but most informative volume should be a "must" for all people who are interested in Maryland history. Both the archaeologist and historian will find a clear concise picture of Indian occupation in Maryland from the very earliest Archaic (2000 B. C.) to the Late Woodland Period 1700.

This book, so easy to read, explains why Accokeek was chosen by the Indians who occupied it for a long period of time. The arrangement of maps and of the pictures of different types of pottery, and arrowheads, with a cultural sequence at the end, is well executed. It is hoped by all who are interested in the archaeology and history of Maryland that the Alice Ferguson Foundation will continue with additional research and reports.

FREDERICK MATTHEW STEINER

Baltimore, Md.

The Regimental Colors of the 175th Infantry (Fifth Maryland). By HAROLD R. MANAKEE and COLONEL ROGER S. WHITEFORD. Baltimore: Military Department, State of Maryland, 1959. xv, 78. Available for $2.00 plus postage from Headquarters, 175th Infantry, Fifth Regiment Armory, Baltimore 1, Maryland.

This small volume is both the history of the regimental colors of the 175th Infantry Regiment as well as a description of the collection of historic flags now at the Fifth Regiment Armory in Baltimore. This regiment differs from other National Guard organizations in that it has the right to carry an individual regimental color and the Confederate battle flag with the national flag. The authors felt it necessary to describe how this privilege was obtained as it was not generally understood.

Actually the book contains little information that is new. It does, however, make available in one convenient volume all this material which was scattered through many other works. It also supplements Mr. Manakee's article on the origin and first use of the Maryland flag which appeared in this magazine in the December issue of 1958.

The book is well and interestingly written. After reading it, one needs no further explanation as to the high morale which accompanies the regimental customs and traditions. The description of the flag collection is a brief history of the military exploits of the regiment and its contributions in all the wars in which it has participated.

FRANK F. WHITE, JR.

Maryland Hall of Records

Some Quaker Portraits, Certain and Uncertain. By JOHN NICKALLS. (*Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, Supplement No. 29.) London: Friends' Historical Society and Philadelphia: Friends Historical Association, 1958. 19. 75 cents.

This small work examines the subject of Quaker portraiture. The author seeks to separate truth from fancy concerning a number of European and American pictures of four early Friends: George Fox, James Naylor, William Penn and William Sewel. Sixteen reproductions, around which the treatment centers, makes it easier to follow the author's discussion. Nickalls rightly believes that, unless more definite evidence is uncovered, all of these likenesses must be viewed as uncertain. Marylanders will be particularly interested in the various portraits of Penn and of Fox who visited Maryland several times in 1672 and 1673.

KENNETH L. CARROLL

Southern Methodist University

Susquehannock Miscellany. Edited by JOHN WITTHOFT and W. FRED KINSEY, III. Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1959. viii, 167 pp. $1.50.

Many years have elapsed since Cadrow's " Archaeological Studies of the Susquehannock Indians " was published. Since then much has been learned about these Indians through continued investigation of Susquehannock sites, archaeological developments in other areas and the use of Radio Carbon dating. This report presents a much needed fresh interpretation and re-evaluation of the Susquehannock Indian data to bring our knowledge of these Indians abreast with advances in archaeological information elsewhere.

" Susquehannock Miscellany " is composed of nine papers prepared by both professional and non-professional archeologists, each dealing with a different aspect of the history and archaeology of these Indians. Reports of particular interest are those concerning the Susquehannock Indians historic role, ancestry, pottery vessels and European trade pipes and were prepared by such recognized authorities as Hunter, Wilthaft, Kinsey and Omwake.

These papers show thorough investigation and analyses of the available data, are excellently presented and include over 140 references for the use of readers interested in increasing their knowledge of early colonial history and Indian archeology of the Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware and Virginia area.

T. LATIMER FORD

Baltimore, Md.

NOTES AND QUERIES

House and Garden Pilgrimage—The 1960 tour of Maryland houses and gardens begins on April 30 with visits to Southern Maryland, and ends on May 21 with a cruise on the new *Port Welcome* from Baltimore to Chestertown. The Pilgrimage is sponsored by the Federated Garden Clubs of Maryland, the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities, the National Society of Colonial Dames of Maryland, the Baltimore Museum of Art, and the Maryland Historical Society. Free Tour Books, with maps, giving full information may be obtained from Pilgrimage Headquarters, Room 223 Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore 2, Md.; telephone VE 7-0228 and MU 5-1000, Ex. 223.

Woulds—Who were the parents of James Woulds of Bay Hundred, Talbot Co.? He was Adjutant of Gen. Smallwood's 5th Regt. during the Revolution. He died in Talbot Co. in 1785. His wife was Alice ———, born *circa* 1741, died in Baltimore in 1826. Could her maiden name have been Harrington or Tilghman? Two of their daughters were Ann Woulds and Alice Harington Woulds. Ann married (1) Edmund Channell, Baltimore flour merchant; (2) Capt. Joseph Hook, Sen. of Baltimore Co. Alice Harington married George Wall, Baltimore builder. Further information—for a family genealogy—will be greatly appreciated.

JOHN B. MAHOOL, JR.
308 Woodlawn Road
Baltimore 10, Md.

Cook-Johnson-Brashier—The birth and death dates are wanted for Captain George Cook, a naval officer in the Revolutionary War, born in Calvert County, Maryland; also his marriage date to Elizabeth Johnson, Calvert County, is wanted and the death date of Elizabeth Johnson Cook. Also the birth date of Col. Thomas Cook Brashier is desired. He died in New Market, Maryland, June 17, 1851, and was the son of Dr. Belt Brashier and his wife, Anne Cook Brashier. Bible records are preferred if available.

MISS LUCY SPRIGG DORSEY
729 Euclid Avenue
Orlando, Florida

Archer Letters—Referring to Footnote No. 1 in Mr. Hopkins's compilation of letters from James J. Archer, an officer in the Mexican War (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, December, 1959, p. 408), Mr. Paul says: "I regret not having made it clear that the Archer property at Rock Run adjoins my farm in Harford County, but was never a part of it."

Larmore—Information is desired about the following persons who were married in Somerset County, Md., on the dates indicated: Ebenezer Larmore and Rosa or Rosetta Dunn on January 16, 1810; Mary Larrimore and Richard Dunn in May 1798.

A. M. LARMORE
Kennett Square, Pa.

Jefferson—Information is requested about this family: Richard J., who died in 1743, Worcester Co., had sons, Richard, John F. and Absolom. I would appreciate any information regarding them and a book by Warren Jefferson, *100 Years of the Jefferson and Tindall (Tyndall) Family*, also Benjamin J. of Calvert Co. who died 1788; married ——— Wood. He had children John, Hambleton, Henry, Basil, William, Leonard and Violetta.

MRS. MAHLON E. ARNETT
816 Chester Ave.,
San Marino, Calif.

Walmsley—Information is requested about the ancestry of Robert Walmsley who died in Maryland in 1770. He was married to Alethea Tylden. Who were her parents? She was of Kent Co., Md. Who were R. W.'s parents and where were they from?

MRS. DAVID C. LOKER,
1401 Napoleon Avenue, Apartment 3,
New Orleans 15, La.

Wherrett—Who was and from whence came to Maryland the Wm. Wherrett mentioned as "possessor," in conjunction with Col. Additon, of 50 acres of Edward's Freehold, St. George's Hundred, St. Mary's County, Maryland, under date of 1640 and again in conjunction with Wm. Watts, "possessors" of 250 acres of Watts Lodge on the back of Bushnell's Rest, Poplar Hill Hundred as of Dec. 18, 1665, all as recorded in the Calvert Papers, No. 885½, pages 15 and 21 respectively.

WM. NORMAN WHERRETT
RD No. 1, Box 39-A
Easton, Maryland

Moody in Baltimore—We are eager to obtain a copy of *Moody in Baltimore*, by Thomas M. Beadenkopf and W. Raymond Stricklen, Johns Hopkins students, issued in 1879 by the Sun Printing Office. This small but interesting volume gives a valuable account of D. L. Moody's great 1878-79 campaign there. Perhaps one of your readers may have a copy to sell, or donate, for our collection of historical material relating to the great 19th century evangelist and founder of our school. We also want letters, photographs, or clippings relating to his work, but do *not* need most of the other biographies and books of sermons available today.

Bernard R. DeRemer
Moody Bible Institute
820 N. La Salle St.
Chicago 10, Ill.

Fulham Papers Project—Of major interest to historians of Colonial America will be a project sponsored by the General Theological Seminary in New York City. Plans for the classifying and cataloguing of the Fulham Papers, now housed in Lambeth Palace Library, London, have been completed, according to an announcement by the Very Rev. Lawrence Rose, dean of the seminary. A well known American church historian, Dr. William W. Manross, has been appointed a research fellow of the seminary to undertake the work. Preserved until recent times at Fulham Palace, residence of the Bishops of London, the Fulham papers contain letters sent by colonial clergymen to their bishop in England. Since the Bishop of London had authority over all Church of England ministers located in the new world, the collection includes files of correspondence from every colony extending back for more than a century before the American Revolution.

The General Theological Seminary
Chelsea Square, New York 11, New York
CHelsea 3-1607 (Herbert D. Thomas)

Maryland Genealogical Society—The Maryland Genealogical Society, organized in 1959, extends a cordial invitation to interested persons to attend meetings of that Society, which are held the second Wednesday of every month at the Main Branch of the Pratt Library at 7:30 P. M.

J. Harrison Daniels, Pres.
213 S. Rolling Road
Baltimore 28, Md.

CONTRIBUTORS

LORRAINE W. PEARCE is a student of American decorative arts. She has recently published an article on Lannuier in *Antiques*. Mrs. Pearce is a graduate of the Winterthur program of the University of Delaware.

JANE N. GARRETT is a member of the staff of the Boston Athenaeum and Book Review Editor of the *New England Quarterly*. Mrs. Garrett is also a graduate of the University of Delaware, Winterthur program.

PETER WALNE is County Archivist of Berkshire, Reading, England, and is a specialist in the study of seals. He has contributed several articles on colonial seals to American journals. Mr. Walne is also a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

KENNETH L. CARROLL is associate professor of the faculty of Southern Methodist University.

Since our printers, the J. H. Furst Co., have been engaged in moving their plant to 109 Market Place, Baltimore, we trust that any delay in the appearance of this issue of the MAGAZINE will be excused.